280.20K
H891.2

St. Mark's Library
THE
General Theological
Seminary

Chelsea Square · New York

Maryland Diocesan Library
The Memorial Library
of the Reverend Edwin A. Dalrymple.
Whittingham Collection

MARYLAND DIOCESAN LIBRARY,
1106-1108 MADISON AVENUE,
LENDING DEPARTMENT.

From Judge Stewart's Library

No. 2852

LETTERS TO M. GONDON,

AUTHOR OF

"MOUVEMENT RELIGIEUX EN ANGLETERRE," "CONVERSION DE CENT CINQUANTE MINISTRES ANGLICANS," &c. &c. &c.

ON THE

DESTRUCTIVE CHARACTER

OF THE

Church of Rome,

BOTH IN RELIGION AND POLITY.

BY

CHR. WORDSWORTH, D.D.

CANON OF WESTMINSTER.

Second Edition.

LONDON:

FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.

1847.

280.20K
W891.2

192335

LONDON:
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

MARYLAND DIOCESAN
LIBRARY

TO

M. JULES GONDON,

AUTHOR OF

"MOUVEMENT RELIGIEUX EN ANGLETERRE;" "CONVERSION DE CENT CINQUANTE MINISTRES ANGLICANS, OU PERSONNES DE DISTINCTION;" "MOTIFS DE CONVERSION DE DIX MINISTRES ANGLICANS;" &c. &c.

MY DEAR SIR,

I have been induced by public and private considerations to address the following Letters to you.

You have taken a lively interest in our religious affairs, and have evinced considerable knowledge of them in your periodical and other publications*, for copies of which I am indebted to your kindness; and from personal intercourse with you, to which I look

* M. Gondon also announces for immediate publication a Translation of Mr. Newman's Essay on Development—"ouvrage traduit de l'Anglais avec l'approbation de l'auteur."

back with feelings of pleasure and of cordial regard for your friendship, I am persuaded that the sentiments expressed in your writings are deeply imprinted on your mind.

Your acquaintance also with the productions of the English press supplied me with another motive for addressing you; and I am glad to be able to think that the references in the following Letters to our Writers, particularly Theological, find an appropriate place in a correspondence with one who has paid especial attention to the Literature and Religion of England.

In writing freely to a friend concerning the religious and political system of the Church of Rome, to which he is strongly attached, I cannot expect his concurrence in all I have said on that subject, at least until he has very carefully examined the grounds of my assertions; but I should deeply regret if any thing should be found in these Letters which is justly chargeable with asperity or illiberality towards that Church or any of her members.

My main design has been to endeavour to show unreservedly, but not uncharitably, what the real

nature and necessary results of the ecclesiastical and civil principles of Rome are; and to prove, at the same time, that *we* enjoy in *this country* a form of Religion and Polity which other Nations may do well to imitate, and which we are bound to maintain: and thus I have aimed to promote the cause of Truth and of Peace.

Allow me now to submit what I have written to your candid and serious consideration, and to subscribe myself, my dear Sir, with sincere regard,

Yours faithfully,

CHR. WORDSWORTH.

Cloisters, Westminster,
March 1, 1847.

ADVERTISEMENT

TO

THE SECOND EDITION.

Since the publication of the first edition of these Letters, various inquiries have been made of the Author concerning the *Hungarian Confession*, from which some extracts are introduced in pages 69—71. He therefore thinks it right to print the original entire. It will be seen that it is introduced with the names "supremi magistratus spiritualis et sæcularis." He follows the text of the collection of Symbolical Books of the Church of Rome, printed at Göttingen in 1838, Vol. II. pp. 343—346, and edited by two learned members of that Church, Streitwolf and Klener.

Confessio Romano-Catholica, in Hungaria Evangelicis publice præscripta et proposita.

I. Fatemur et confitemur, nos singulari cura supremi nostri magistratus spiritualis et sæcularis, diligentia et ope Dominorum Patrum Soc. Jesu, ab hæretica via et fide ad veram Catholico-Romanam salvificam deductos esse, eamque ore nostro et lingua universo mundo aperte ad notitiam velle dare.

II. Confitemur, Papam Romanum caput esse Ecclesiæ, nec errare posse.

III. Confitemur, et certi sumus, Papam Romanum Vicarium esse Christi, plenariamque habere potestatem, omnibus hominibus, pro voluntate sua, peccata remittendi, retinendi, [in] infernum detrudendi, excommunicandique.

IV. Confitemur, quicquid Papa instituerit novi, sive intra sive extra Scripturam, quicquid etiam demandaverit, esse verum, divinum et salvificum; ideoque a Laicis majoris æstimari debere, Dei vivi præceptis.

V. Confitemur, Papam Sanctissimum ab omnibus honore divino honorari debere, majori cum genuflexione, ipsi Christo debita.

VI. Confitemur et asserimus, Papam ab omnibus, tamquam Patrem Sanctissimum, in omnibus esse audiendum sine omni exceptione; ejus institutis dirigentibus contrafacientes, sine omni misericordia tales Hæreticos non solum igne tollendos, sed et cum corpore et anima inferno tradendos.

VII. Confitemur, lectionem Scripturæ Sacræ ortum esse hæresium, et sectarum, scaturiginemque blasphemiæ.

VIII. Confitemur, mortuos Sanctos et Sanctas invocare, Imagines eorum honorare, coram eis genua incurvare, ad eos peregrinari, [eos] vestire, lumina eis accendere, bonum, pium, sanctum, utile et salutare esse.

IX. Confitemur, unumquemque Sacerdotem multo majorem esse Deipara, B. Virgine Maria, quæ semel solum peperit Christum, nec amplius parit. Sacerdos autem Romanus non solum, dum vult, sed et quandocumque vult, offert et facit Christum, imo et creatum absumit.

X. Confitemur, pro mortuis Missas celebrare, eleemosynas distribuere, orare, utile ac salutare esse.

XI. Confitemur, Papam Romanum habere potestatem Scripturam immutandi, pro voluntate augendi et minuendi sua.

XII. Confitemur, animas post mortem in Purgatorio purgari, ac Missas Sacerdotum eis auxilium cum eliberatione esse.

XIII. Confitemur, sub una specie Eucharistiam percipere, bonum et salutare; sub utraque, hæreticum et damnabile esse.

XIV. Confitemur et asserimus, hos, qui sub una specie utuntur, totum Christum cum carne et sanguine, cum Deitate et ossibus, uti, vel percipere; qui vero sub utraque, solo nudo pane frui et vesci.

XV. Confitemur, septem esse vera et realia Sacramenta.

XVI. Confitemur, Deum in imaginibus honorari, ac per eas ab hominibus agnosci.

XVII. Confitemur, Mariam, Beatam Virginem, majore honore dignam ab Angelis et hominibus, ipso Christo, Filio Dei.

XVIII. Confitemur, Beatam Virginem Mariam esse Reginam Cœli, simulque cum Filio regnare, cui Filium omnia ad voluntatem ejus facere debere.

XIX. Confitemur, ossa Sanctorum magnam habere virtutem, unde ab hominibus honoranda esse, ipsisque sacella exstruenda.

XX. Confitemur, doctrinam Romanam esse Catholicam, puram, divinam, salvificam, antiquam et veram ; evangelicam autem falsam, erroneam, blasphemam, maledictam, hæreticam, damnosam, seditiosam, impiam, excogitatam ac fictam. Cum igitur in totum et plenarie, in omnibus explicationibus, religio Romana sub una specie bona sit et salutaris, ideo maledicimus omnibus illis, qui nos in hæresi adversa et impia sub utraque erudierunt. Maledictos pronuntiamus Parentes nostros, in fide illa hæretica nos educantes ; maledicimus quoque et illis, qui nobis Romano-Catholicam fidem in dubium vocarunt, sicut et ducibus * illis, qui nobis maledicto illo calice subservierunt. Imo nobis ipsis maledicimus, maledictosque nos pronuntiamus, eo quod ex maledicto illo calice hæretico (ex quo nobis bibere non decebat) participavimus.

XXI. Confitemur, Scripturam Sanctam esse imperfectam et litteram mortuam, quousque a Summo Pontifice ea non fuerit explicata, et Laicis ad legendum concessa.

XXII. Confitemur, unam Missam Sacerdotis Romani utiliorem esse centum et pluribus concionibus Evangelicorum. Ex eo maledicimus libris illis, quos legimus, doctrinam illam hæreticam et blasphemiam comprehendentibus. Maledictionem etiam superinducimus super omnia opera nostra, (in fide illa hæretica exsistendo) patrata, ne in extremo die coram Deo nobis aliquid mereantur. Hæc omnia ex candido pectore facimus, asserentes, Romanam Ecclesiam in his et similibus articulis esse verissimam, cum solenni hæreticæ illius doctrinæ, coram Vobis, Viri honorati, Matronæ honoratæ, Juvenes et Virgines præsentes, renuntiatione. Juramus insuper, numquam amplius nos ad hæreticam illam sub utraque (etiamsi licitum esset, vel fuerit), vita durante conversuros. Juramus etiam, donec una gutta sanguinis in corpore nostro extiterit, doctrinam maledictam illam evangelicam, nos omnimode, clàm et aperte, violenter et fraudulenter, verbo et facto persecuturos, ense quoque non excluso. Ultimum juramus (immutatione fors in statu sæculari vel spirituali subsecutura), nos coram Deo, Angelis et Vobis præsentibus, neque metu aut gratia, ab hac salvifica Romano-Catholica Ecclesia et divina discessuros unquam, et ad hæresin evangelicam maledictam redituros et reversuros, vel amplexuros.

* ducibus *ex conjectura, pro* DUOBUS *quod in textu est.*

LETTERS,

&c.

LETTER I.

Laudatis antiqua, sed novè de die vivitis.
TERTULLIAN, Apol. 6.

MY DEAR SIR,

At the close of the last letter which I had the pleasure of receiving from you, you expressed your satisfaction at the present posture of affairs in England, as far as concerns religion. You appeared to cherish a hope, not only that *individuals* in the two countries, France and England, but that the two *nations* themselves might be brought into close approximation in this respect,—in short, that *we* might be *reconciled*, as you would express it, to the Church of Rome.

Since that letter was written much has occurred in France and England to strengthen that expectation. The number of *converts* to Rome has been

augmented by fresh accessions, of which full details have been published by you, and circulated in your country; and a demonstration has been made of the same hope from one end of France to the other. No less than thirty-nine of your Archbishops and Bishops have enjoined the Clergy and Laity of their dioceses to offer up public prayers for the conversion of England. Masses have been said and litanies chanted for the "return of England," as you term it, "to the Unity of the Church." Indulgences have been granted to all Priests who offer the sacrifice of the Altar, and to all laymen who partake of it, in the *intention* of interceding for our restoration to the Faith. Nor is this all. Rome has spoken. The Supreme Pontiff has authorized a *Novena* to be celebrated in the Church of the Jesuits in his own city for our conversion. He has granted three hundred days' indulgence to all who visited the Church during the *Novena*, and *plenary* indulgence to those who, after confession and communion, paid five visits to the Church during that period.

In the year 1553, Pope Julius III. struck a medal with the inscription *Anglia resurges*—"England, thou shalt rise again"—on which Queen Mary* is

* Thus described in the Historia Pontificum, Paris, 1677: "In hoc nummo regina Maria depingitur quæ Pontificem prona veneratur, astante Polo Cardinale. Hic autem nummus gratulatur Angliæ ab errore resurgenti."

represented kneeling before the Pontiff, and receiving his blessing. Perhaps the present Pope has a prophetic vision of a similar scene. Certain it is, that you look with no ordinary interest at present towards England; and we ought not to be surprised at your hopes, or at the announcement of them to the world. But, permit me to say, whatever *you* may think, *we* must *deplore* the occasion and cause of your anticipations, not only for our sakes, but also for *your own*. The great majority of Englishmen believe that many of the tenets of the Church of Rome are of such a kind as to peril the souls of those who hold them; and that when carried out in practice they tend to disturb the peace and safety of empires: and they therefore deeply lament that events should have occurred in *this* country to bind *you* in closer bondage to those doctrines; and that England should thus have served to promote the cause of Rome.

It would, therefore, be much to be regretted if nothing were supplied you from this country to repair the mischief we have done you. Hence it is that I have ventured, not without reluctance, to take my pen to address you after a silence of more than a year; and you will pardon me, I am sure, if I reply to your last letter through the medium of the press, in the hope that if what I submit to your consideration should prove of any value, it may be useful to others as well as to yourself.

Before I proceed further, allow me to acquaint you with my opinions concerning your relation and that of the Church of France generally to us in England and to our Church.

It is my belief that our Blessed Lord designed His Church to be commensurate with the world in extent, and coexistent with it in duration. This Church,—thence called Catholic or Universal,—has many constituent elements, commonly termed *particular Churches.* Some of these are in a sounder state than others; some are in a healthy, some in a morbid, some in a moribund condition. Start not, I pray you, if I profess my conviction that the Church of Rome is of this *last* description; and that those national Churches which communicate with her in *all* her doctrines are necessarily in the same predicament.

At the same time I readily allow that the corruptions of a Church are not in themselves sufficient to justify its members in *separating* from it. *Wilful* schism is a mortal sin. No *disease* can be imagined so great that this can be its *remedy.* No Church on earth is perfect: the Apostolic and Apocalyptic Churches were tainted with heresies. Tares there are, and ever will be, mixed with the wheat in every part of the universal field of the Church; and if the wheat will uproot itself because of the tares near it, it must look to grow, or rather to *wither,* in the *air,* for it will never find a place to its mind in the

soil. Therefore do not suppose that I am calling on you or any one else to *pluck himself* up from that part of the field in which he has been sown by the providence of God. No: let him only take care not to be *tares*, but to be *good wheat.*

But, then, you must suffer me to add, that the case may occur of a Church not allowing any persons to communicate with her *except* on this condition, that they communicate with her in her *corruptions.* A schism *must* then take place; and wilful schism, as was before said, is a mortal sin; and wo to him who gives *occasion* to it; wo to him, I say, "by whom the offence cometh." It is clear that in the case supposed the whole guilt of the schism lies with that *Church* which *imposes sinful* terms of communion: and the party who does not communicate with her does not *separate himself*, that is, is not guilty of schism. He is not the *injurer*, but the *injured:* he does not *commit* evil, but *suffer* it.

Whether the Church of Rome *does* impose sinful terms of communion on her *lay* members I leave you to judge: that she *does* impose them on her *Clergy*, by compelling them to subscribe the Creed of Pius IV.,—which contains twelve articles not merely *unknown* to the Primitive Church, but, for the most part, *contrary* to what it received from Christ and His Apostles, and *destructive* of it,—with an express declaration that "out of this faith" so

enforced "there is no salvation,"—does not appear to me to admit of a doubt, and that, whether any one *subscribes* this creed or no, the Church of Rome is guilty of schism by *obtruding* it, I for my part cannot hesitate to affirm. If the whole of her Priesthood were to abjure this oath as an illicit one, she herself would alone be responsible for what *she would call* their *apostasy.*

But I am writing to a *layman;* and you will now understand from what I have said, that I make a broad distinction between yourself, born in France and baptized in the Church of Rome, and remaining in its communion, and those who have been baptized in the Church of England, and fall away from it. Let the Church of England be as defective as they allege she is in means of spirituality and holiness, let her even be as corrupt as *we* affirm the Church of Rome to be, still they cannot prove that she is not *a* Church, and that she is not *the* Church in which they themselves have been baptized; and unless they can clearly demonstrate that she has *excommunicated* them by *imposing on them sinful terms of communion,* as we can show that the Church of Rome *does* excommunicate all those who cannot receive the unscriptural and anti-scriptural additions she has made to the faith of the Apostles and of all the Apostolic Churches, they have severed themselves from the Church Catholic, and are guilty of the heinous sin of *schism.* They are aiders and

abettors of those who set up Altar against Altar, Priest against Priest, and Bishop against Bishop; that is, they are the promoters of "confusion and every evil work." It is vain, therefore, for them to speak of their "having *joined* the Church of *Rome:*" they have joined *no* Church, nor *can* they do so. They are *wilful* schismatics, and, as such, have put themselves out of communion with the *whole* Catholic Church. They are "sine matre, sine sede, orbi fide, extorres sine lare*," like Cain. Let them even then possess the knowledge of Apostles, and the faith of Martyrs, and the eloquence of Angels, yea, let them give all their goods to feed the poor, and their bodies to be burned, yet they have broken the bonds of Church unity, and therefore they have not charity; for, as St. Augustine says, "non habent Dei charitatem, qui non diligunt Ecclesiæ unitatem†;" and therefore their gifts and graces, whatever they may be, profit them nothing, but only serve to increase their condemnation.

You will understand, then, my dear sir, that I do not charge *you* with schism, as I do *them*. But still you will pardon me, I trust, if I venture to say that *your* true wisdom, and your true charity to yourself and to your Church, would be not to confirm her in her errors by collecting examples and publishing catalogues of the apostasies which have taken place

* Tertullian, Præscr. Hæret. 42.

† c. Donat. iii. 21.

in England, but to examine the faith and practice of *your own* Church by the standard of Reason, Scripture, and primitive Antiquity; and having observed her miserable declensions from it, to endeavour to raise her to the position in which she once stood, and from which she has now most lamentably fallen. Oh! that you, and others of ability, knowledge, and zeal like you, would labour to bring *back* your Church to what she *was* in the days of your Hilary and of your Irenæus! What a noble exercise would this be of your piety and patriotism! You have had appeals from England, calling on you to pray for *our* conversion; let now another voice, however feeble, of a different kind, excite you to labour and pray for *your own reformation!*

But to revert to your letter. You there dwelt with pleasurable anticipations on what you regarded as the probable results of an event which had not then taken place,—the admission of the Rev. J. H. Newman "into the communion of the Church of Rome." That event, alas! has now occurred, and, as you are aware, at the same time with it a work appeared from his pen, entitled "An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine."

Before I proceed further, let me say, *once for all*, what I request you carefully to bear in mind, in reading the present letter and the others that may follow it from me. I shall have frequent occasion to refer in them to the "Essay on Development," but

my object in writing to you is not to compose a criticism on *that book*. This has been done by others; particularly by the learned master of Winchester College, Dr. Moberly, the Rev. Wm. Palmer of Worcester College, the Rev. W. J. Irons, and Professor Butler of Dublin *. But my present concern is not with any individual work or person whatsoever, but with a *system;* and I advert to that volume only so far as it is connected with a system, and as it illustrates the proposition which I shall endeavour to prove in the following letters—I mean the *destructive* character of Romish principles. When carried to their legitimate results, they are, in my opinion, subversive of all that is most valuable and sacred in morals, politics, and religion. The day seems to be fast approaching when this fact will be still more clearly manifested to the world by practical evidence than has ever yet been the case. You yourselves are suffering from these principles in France both as a State and a Church; and when you pray that England may espouse them, your desire, as it appears to me, amounts to this, that we should be the victims of a system which must plunge us in anarchy and infidelity. But I return for a few minutes to the Essay.

* It were much to be wished that the admirable letters of the last-mentioned writer, addressed to the editor of the "Irish Ecclesiastical Journal," could be circulated more extensively by being published in a separate form.

More than a year has now elapsed since the publication of this volume, which the author (as he states in the postscript) "submits to the judgment of the Church, with whose doctrine on the subjects of which it treats he wishes all his thoughts to be coincident." Sufficient time, therefore, has been given to ascertain the opinions of Roman Catholic divines, and of the Church of Rome generally, with respect to it. These opinions may be inferred partly from what she has *not* done, and partly from what she *has* done with respect to it.

The preface is dated October the 6th, 1845, and on the 8th of the same month the author was received into communion with the Church of Rome. He came, therefore, into that communion with this book in his hands. It was, if I may so speak, his passport; his profession of faith. Now, I would observe, that all who have been abettors of heresy (so-called), and who are afterwards admitted into the Roman communion, are required by the Church of Rome in her Pontifical* to anathematize all heresy, to swear that they hold the same faith as the Church of Rome, and that they will ever remain in communion with the Supreme Pontiff; and to declare that all who oppose this faith are deserving of eternal execration. You must allow that if the Church of Rome is a pure Church, the author of the "Essay on Development" had been an abettor of heresy.

* Pontificale, p. 449, ed. Rom. 1818.

He had called the Church of Rome "crafty, obstinate, wilful, malicious, cruel, unnatural, as mad men are; or, rather, she may be said to resemble a demoniac. She is her real self only in name, and till God vouchsafe to restore her, we must treat her as if she were the Evil One who governs her. And in saying this, I must not be supposed to deny that there is any real excellence in Romanism even as it is, or that any real excellent men are its adherents. Satan ever acts on a system *." The writer of these words could not (I conclude) have been admitted into your communion without satisfactory evidence that he had passed from heresy into orthodoxy, in your sense of the terms.

Hence it is impossible not to infer, that the reception of the author into the Church of Rome, bearing this volume with him, is tantamount to a declaration of his conviction, and to an acknowledgment on the part of the Church which so received him, that this publication is in accordance with, or, at least, not contrary to, the teaching of that Church. Indeed, by the *retractation* prefixed to his volume of his *former* language "reflecting on the Church of Rome," he intimates, what he also declares, that the *present* volume is "directed to the removal of obstacles lying in the way of communion with that Church †." Besides this, the Church of Rome possesses what is

* Newman's Prophetical Office of the Church, p. 103.

† Advertisement prefixed to the Essay on Development.

called a *Congregazione dell' Indice,* a Congregation for examining books, and for putting those which are disapproved by it into the Index Expurgatorius; and this Congregation has been very active lately, as your Procureur-General and Member of your Chamber of Deputies, M. Dupin, can bear witness, whose Manual has been enrolled * among the prohibited books by the Pope: but I do *not* hear that the "Essay on Development" has shared the same fate. No: *that book* has not been put into the *Index,*—but its *author* is now in the *Propaganda!*

In addition to all this, the work in question has not only been called "un beau fruit" by your leading Ecclesiastical Review †, but it has received encomiums from Romanist Prelates and Divines in this country. Thus, for instance, a writer in the Dublin Review ‡, who, we are informed § by a Romanist Clergyman, is a Bishop of the Romish Communion, thus speaks of Mr. Newman and his Essay. "The reader must peruse this volume as the description of the process

* With several other books, by a Decree of the Pope, April 7, 1845.

† Le Correspondant, 25th Dec. 1845, p. 906.

‡ Dublin Review, Dec. 1845.

§ The Rev. John Dalton, in the "Tablet," Jan. 24, 1846, p. 54, who says,—"The constant writer in the Dublin Review, on the Religious Movement, is one of our *venerated Bishops.*" Six of these articles have been reprinted from the Dublin Review, and circulated, with Bishop Wiseman's name as their author, by the "Catholic Institute of Great Britain." Dr. Wiseman appealed to the Bishops of France for their prayers in behalf of the British Nation in a letter dated Paris, 1845, and reprinted by M. Gondon.

of reasoning by which the author's powerful and well-stored mind was brought to a *full accordance with Catholic* Truth *." "*Never* did convert come to the Church with mind, soul, and heart *more thoroughly* made over to her cause, with more *complete* hearty and filial allegiance, than *this work shows* him to have done †. The Catholic system is embraced (in it) with the fervour and simplicity of *one trained from* infancy to the Faith ‡."

Such is the verdict which has been pronounced on this work by one who (it is said) holds an Episcopal office in the Church of Rome—a Church, be it observed, which never ceases to assure us that *the most perfect unity* of judgment and practice exists in her communion; and therefore what is promulgated by *one* Bishop may be received as the opinion of *all*.

But further still, another Romanist Prelate in this kingdom has paid a still more flattering tribute, of another kind, to this work. Dr. Gillis, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Edinburgh, has delivered a series of Lectures upon it in the Scotch capital §. He has

* Dublin Review, Dec. 1845, p. 527.

† P. 532. ‡ P. 534.

§ The following account of these Lectures is given in the English Roman Catholic journal, the "Tablet," No. 300, p. 70 (for Jan. 7, 1846):

"Sir,—As every thing connected with our Church *in partibus infidelium* must be interesting to the readers of the 'Tablet,' I take the liberty of mentioning that a series of eight lectures has lately been delivered to the community of this city by our much-valued *Bishop Coadjutor*, Dr. Gillis. The *subject* of these lectures—which have been

thus received the Essayist into the number of the Doctors of the Church of Rome; he has, as it were,

attended, not merely by the members of our Holy Faith, but by large numbers of Protestants of all sects and denominations—was *Mr. Newman's recent Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine;* and their object was to convey a succinct analysis and exhibition of the process of reasoning contained in *that psychological marvel* to such who, either from circumstances, might be unable to procure access to the volume, or be incapable, without some guidance, of following the line of argument pursued by the distinguished essayist. This Dr. Gillis accomplished with his accustomed eloquence and perspicuity. By taking separately each of Mr. Newman's tests, and illustrating his relative deductions by the parallels adduced by the reasoner, and those abundant evidences afforded by the peculiar features of the Establishment at home, and the cradle-land of the Deformation—Germany; the blasphemies of both, and the infidelity now openly flourishing in the one country, and rapidly becoming developed in the other; Dr. Gillis, as it were, *illuminated that most important essay*, and extended the principles of its learned author to the comprehension of the humblest and least instructed, as well as to the admiration and charm of his more favoured auditors. These lectures, *we know*, have already been productive of much good, and will yet effect more; and we have heard several liberal and learned Protestants express their regret that his Lordship has brought the course to a conclusion. For while Dr. Gillis unflinchingly and boldly denounced and exposed the infamous calumnies heaped upon God's Church, and the lamentable errors and ignorance of her aspersors, he testified the beauty of its holiness by the affectionate charity and kindness with which he solicited mercy and enlightenment from heaven on the individuals themselves. From the obvious benefit resulting from these lectures of his Lordship, I have accordingly deemed it my duty to convey the fact to your columns, respectfully suggesting that a similar course should be adopted in the various districts of the kingdom wherever 'two or three are gathered together,' as such expositions are but due to Mr. Newman, and conducive to the honour of that glorious Church, at the foot of whose altars he has laid this 'reason for the faith that is in him.'—I have the honour to be, Sir, your most obedient servant, Δ.

"Edinburgh, St. John Chrysostom, 1846."

placed his "Essay on Development" by the side of the Libri Sententiarum of Peter Lombard, and the Secunda Secundæ of Thomas Aquinas.

Nor is this all. We find from the Ecclesiastical Intelligencer of the Continent, the *Univers*, that the author of the "Essay on Development" has been honoured with a mark of approval and favour from the Pope himself. The same letters from Rome, which state to the readers of that periodical that the *whole month of March* of last year has been devoted, by a religious Society in that city, to prayers for the conversion of England, apprises us that "the Holy Father (Gregory XVI.) has presented a beautiful crucifix to Mr. Newman*." The present Pope, Pius IX., has also given public proofs of the same feelings. The author of the "Essay on Development" has been admitted to reside in the great Missionary College of Rome, and has been allowed to *preach* in a church,

* "*Rome*, 18 *Mars*, 1846.—La fête de saint Grégoire a été célébrée le 12 de ce mois en grande solennité dans la belle église du Monte-Celio, au couvent des Camaldules. Un triduo y avait été ordonné pour demander à Dieu *la conversion de l'Angleterre*. Une foule de catholiques anglais étaient venus s'agenouiller au pied de ces autels, d'où, à la voix de saint Grégoire, sont partis les apôtres qui convertirent la Grande-Bretagne. A l'occasion de cette fête touchante, une pieuse association s'est formée dans le but de consacrer tout le mois de mars à des prières pour la conversion de l'Angleterre. Un grand nombre de messes sont dites tous les jours à cette intention au Jésu et dans toutes les églises et chapelles particulières de Rome.

"Le *Saint Père* (Greg. XVI.) *a fait présent d'un beau crucifix à M. Newman.*"

although, in your eyes, he is a layman, and is gone from us *to receive holy orders* at Rome.

Such are the tidings we receive from Italy; and from Paris we learn at the time when I am addressing you, that Mr. Newman, on his way to Rome "to *receive holy orders,*" was welcomed with marks of tender cordiality by the Archbishop of Paris, and by the Nuncio of the Apostolic See*: no less marked was the welcome he received from the most eminent Bishop of the French Church of the present day, the Bishop of Langres †, and an earnest hope is expressed by the leading Romanist Journal of France, that "after having saluted the tombs of the Apostles, he will return, strong in the graces he will have re-

* *Univers*, 13 Septembre.—See the following page.

† *Univers*, 20th Sept. 1846. "On nous écrit de *Langres*,—

'La présence du R. J. H. Newman dans notre ville n'a pas excité moins d'intérêt qu'à Paris. Sa simplicité et sa modestie ont fait le charme de toutes les personnes qui ont eu l'avantage d'être admises auprès de lui. Notre vénérable évêque l'a accueilli avec l'empressement et la cordialité d'un frère. *Quarante à cinquante membres* de notre clergé ont eu l'honneur d'être présentés à celui dont la parole éloquente émouvait jadis la jeunesse studieuse de la première université d'Angleterre. Les marques de sympathie dont le savant écrivain a été l'objet lui ont dit le bonheur qu'éprouvent les catholiques de le compter parmi leurs frères. L'anxiété avec laquelle on cherchait à apprendre de ses lèvres les progrès du mouvement religieux de sa patrie trahissait l'intérêt avec lequel la France suit la renaissance de l'Angleterre. Il nous semblait voir dans la personne de M. Newman, allant se jeter aux pieds du vicaire de Jésus-Christ, un avant-coureur dépêché par l'Angleterre pour aller porter à Rome la nouvelle de son retour à la foi de ses pères. Puissent ces douces espérances se réaliser un jour! Quels hommes admirables que ces convertis d'Oxford! Dieu ne s'est pas choisi sans dessein des instruments si propres à accomplir de grandes choses.'"

ceived, and in the benediction of the vicar of Jesus Christ, to *evangelize his country.*" The expressions to which I advert will remain as a record to posterity of your hopes, and as a testimony from you of the honour due in the opinion of your hierarchy from the See of Rome to the author of the "Essay on Development *."

* "*Paris*, 12 *Septembre*.—Le révérend John Henry Newman, premier chef de la célèbre école qui, aujourd'hui, a le docteur Pusey pour maître, vient de passer trois jours à Paris. Il en est parti hier, se rendant à Langres, où il va serrer la main de son ami et disciple, le révérend Dobré Dalgairns, qui, comme lui, après avoir embrassé la foi catholique, se prépare, par le recueillement et l'étude, *à l'exercice du saint ministère*. Dans les courts instants que le savant théologien anglais a passés ici, il a visité les principaux monuments religieux de la capitale de la France. Il a été *reçu avec les marques d'une tendre cordialité par Mgr. le nonce apostolique et par Mgr. l'archevêque de Paris*, qui, l'un et l'autre, ont été heureux de pouvoir lui exprimer de vive voix tout ce que leur cœur avait éprouvé d'allégresse en apprenant la conversion d'un esprit si éminent. L'ancien curé de Sainte-Marie et de Littlemore s'est agenouillé dans l'église où la piété des fidèles vénère les reliques de saint Vincent de Paul. . . .

"Ajoutons que *ce célèbre enfant de l'Eglise* n'a pas voulu quitter Paris sans faire une visite à Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, ce sanctuaire où reposent les trophées de tant de conquêtes modernes du catholicisme, où chaque semaine un prêtre vénérable et vénéré lit au milieu d'une foule pieuse le bulletin des *victoires remportées sous les auspices de Marie*. Celui dont la conversion avait été dans ces murs sacrés l'objet de vives et persévérantes prières, venait se confondre parmi les fidèles qui avaient adressé leurs supplications au Ciel, et, à son tour, lui aussi priait pour la conversion des amis dont il s'est séparé et de sa patrie tout entière. Le séjour de M. Newman à Paris a été court, parce qu'il a hâte de se rendre à Rome, où il se propose de *passer l'hiver et de recevoir les ordres sacrés*. Sa présence dans la capitale du monde chrétien ne saurait être un événement sans importance pour l'Angleterre religieuse. Le travail de régénération qui s'opère ne peut manquer d'en recevoir une impulsion nouvelle. L'intérêt que cette circonstance éveillera en faveur de l'Eglise renaissante

Looking, then, at the reception of the author of the "Essay on Development" into the Church of Rome, with this volume as his confession of Faith,—looking at the tributes of honour which have been paid to him and his work, by Prelates of your Church, and by the Pope; considering also that *unity* of doctrine and practice is affirmed by your Church to be her special badge and prerogative, we should be guilty of great disrespect to her if we did not allow that this work is (to adopt the first-mentioned Bishop's words) "in *full* accordance with Catholic truth" as received and professed in the communion of Rome. You cannot wish us to imagine that the infallible Head of the Church of Rome can have been deluded; and that he can have extended his favour to the publisher of a Theory inconsistent with Roman orthodoxy. It would be very unjust to your Prelates, to suppose that, arrived at their stage of life and dignity, they can have had, as it were, to go a second time to school, and learn a *new* "Theory of Christian Doctrine" from the lips of a Neophyte freshly won from the ranks of Protestantism. They are too clear-sighted not to perceive how dangerous

d'Angleterre déterminera, sans aucun doute, des efforts nouveaux pour satisfaire à ses besoins. L'homme le plus éminent que l'anglicanisme ait eu depuis deux siècles raffermira sa science et sa foi dans la ville sainte, et après avoir baisé le tombeau des apôtres, il partira, fort des grâces qu'il aura reçues et de la bénédiction du vicaire de Jésus-Christ, pour *aller évangéliser sa patrie* et lui dire ce qu'il aura vu, entendu et conquis."

an alternative it would be for them to concede that this doctrine, so honoured and lauded by them, *is new* to *them* and to *their Church:* that it is not, in fact, *her* doctrine. They cannot suppose that Religion, like natural Science, admits of *discoveries:* that it has at one time its Ptolemaic system, at another its Tychonic, at another its Copernican and Newtonian, to explain its phenomena. No: this doctrine, if true *now*, must have been *always* true, and it must, in their opinion, have *always* been the doctrine of *that* Church, which they affirm to be the divinely-appointed depository and guardian of all Sacred Truth,—the Church of *Rome.*

Let me refer also to another circumstance, which, I would observe by the way, has given me another reason for writing to you. It appears that you already have *one;* and are likely to have *another translation* of the "Essay on Development" in France. From the terms in which one of these translations is announced, it would appear that the author still abides by the opinions and statements of his book; and it would seem, also, that the Church of Rome, to say the least, does *not disapprove of them.* Indeed, considering the author's present position in a state of tutelage in the Propaganda *, we may say that his

* Extract from the *Univers*, 10th Jan. 1847 :—

"Le révérend M. Newman, dans une lettre récemment écrite de Rome à un de ses amis, exprimait le désir que la traduction de *son bel ouvrage* sur l'*Histoire du Développement de la Doctrine Chrétienne* ne parût pas sans avoir été revue par un ami de son choix. Ce désir

acts are those of his Roman superiors rather than his own; and his expression of a desire for a French translation is tantamount to an *imprimatur* from them.

For my own part, I am persuaded that every one who reflects carefully on the principles of the Church of Rome, illustrated by her practice, will allow that the Romanist Prelates, to whom I have now referred, are correct interpreters of her mind, when they laud and lecture upon the "Essay on Development." I do not hesitate to affirm, that the author has no less

est bien justifié, car les idées qu'il exprime dans cet ouvrage sont souvent si abstraites, et son style est si parfaitement anglais, qu'une simple connaissance de la langue anglaise ne saurait suffire pour reproduire avec toute la précision désirable *ce beau travail*. Ces désirs de M. Newman ont apporté quelque retard dans l'apparition de cet ouvrage; mais, quelque désirée qu'en soit la traduction, mieux vaut qu'elle paraisse un peu plus tard, que d'être livrée au public dans un état imparfait ou n'offrant pas toutes les garanties désirables.

"Le savant néophyte, en exprimant ce désir, ne s'attendait pas à être victime de ce qu'il redoutait davantage. Il apprendra avec douleur qu'une traduction de son ouvrage, pleine d'erreurs grossières, que nous signalerons sans délai, vient de paraître. Nous sommes certains d'être agréables à l'auteur de l'*Histoire du Développement* en signalant cette prétendue traduction de son ouvrage pour ce qu'elle vaut. Il est impossible de pousser plus loin que le traducteur l'ignorance de toutes choses se rattachant à M. Newman et au mouvement religieux de l'Angleterre. Nous justifierons demain cette opinion.

"M. Newman peut se rassurer. Le public français ne le jugera pas sur l'œuvre informe qu'on nous donne sous son nom; il attendra la traduction qui doit paraître *avec son approbation*,—traduction et approbation que la publication dont nous signalons les défauts rendent plus que jamais indispensables."—Mr. Newman dates his public declaration concerning the supposed miraculous cure of the Abbé Blanpin, "from the *College of the Propaganda*, 4 Jan. 1847."

fairly than freely stated the *true*, the *only* Theory of Christian doctrine as taught by the Church of Rome. I do not mean to say that it has always been as clearly *avowed* by her Divines as he has stated it; no, far from it. Some of them, and these very eminent Theologians,—your own Bossuet, for instance, (as I shall hereafter show,)—have struggled vehemently *against* it. *They* have contended as earnestly for an unvarying and invariable *Tradition* of Doctrine, as he does for an unlimited and illimitable *Expansion* of it. Some of your Doctors say that "the Church believes as she has *always* believed," as vehemently as *others* among you affirm, that "the Church is always learning new truths," γηράσκει τ' αἰεὶ πολλὰ διδασκομένη. It will be found that on *this* fundamental question, you have, as in many *others* in your Church, Doctors against Doctors, Bishops against Bishops, Councils against Councils, Popes against Popes. But though you have no *unity* of *teaching* on this subject, yet there is a ruling idea which runs through the *acts* of the Church of Rome: and what Mr. Newman's Essay is in *Theory*, *that* the Papacy is in *Practice*. From Ecclesiastical History, as he reads it, Mr. Newman *constructs* the Papacy; from itself, as it exists, the Papacy interprets Ecclesiastical History. The one proceeds by synthesis, the other by analysis. The Theory of Development is the result of both processes. It is, and *must* be, the Theory of all consistent Romanists. It follows necessarily from

the doctrine of the Papal Infallibility: a living Infallible Power must be *creative*.

The will of the *existing Roman* Church, or, as the Greeks very well express it, *τῆς ἀεὶ Ῥωμαϊκῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, of the Romish Church from time to time*, that is, *en dernier ressort*, the will of the Pope, is, and must be, your *Rule* of *Faith*. Your canon law distinctly avers this, "the *practice* of *Rome*," it says, "is the *law* of *the world* †." *Θῶπτε τὸν κρατοῦντ' ἀεί*, "Bend to him who rules at Rome,"—this is your maxim. Change as he may, he cannot err. Change he will, ("to be perfect is to have changed often," says your new convert ‡,) for it is the property of the Faith to grow, and it is his province to engraft new articles of faith on the original stock. It was once a mere seed; then a tender plant: now it makes new shoots; now it buds and blossoms; and casts out luxuriant branches—,

> ——— nec longum tempus et ingens
> Exiit ad cœlum ramis felicibus arbor,
> Miraturque *novas* frondes et *non sua* poma.
>
> VIRG. GEORG. ii. 80.

There is, I confess, a boldness and fearlessness

* Bacon, the English Jesuit, thus writes in his Analysis Fidei IV. ch. vi. p. 244. 1637:—"Hic modus resolvendi ultimo fidem in regulam vivam sensibilem" (*i. e.* Pontificem Romanum) "ipsissimus est quo usi sunt primi Christiani." Vide p. 246.

† Jus Canon. Decret. Dist. xi. c. 11. "Ab omnibus servari debet quod Romana servat Ecclesia;" and again Dist. xix. c. 2. "Quicquid Romana Ecclesia statuit vel ordinat, ab omnibus observandum est."

‡ P. 39.

about the "Essay on Development," which would be very delightful if it landed the reader on *terra firma*, instead of leaving him like a wrecked mariner on a quicksand of unbelief. The author has evidently dared to despise the dictates of caution which some among his Romanist friends may have suggested to him. *Ausus est vana contemnere*, as was said of Columbus; though we cannot add that, like him, he has found a continent. His "well-stored mind" was not ignorant that the cause of Rome *cannot* be maintained on the grounds of Scripture and Primitive Antiquity; and he is too honest to pretend that it can. He therefore flings them to the winds.

Again, he has too much sense to imagine that it can be defended at the same time by the opposite theories of Tradition and Development. He will not attempt to combine contradictions. He sees that Tradition and Development are, *ex vi terminorum*, antagonist forces; and he will not tie his religion to *both*, knowing that it must be torn in pieces if he does. He has a choice to make between them, and he knows it well. So, *jacta est alea*, he has made his election. He has rejected Antiquity, and has accepted Development.

The aim of war is peace, and the end of controversy is truth. The question is now simplified between the Churches of Rome and England by the "Essay on Development;" and its appearance is,

therefore, in a *certain sense,* a reason for gratitude to Him Whose peculiar attribute it is to bring good out of evil; deeply to be deplored though it be for the author's sake that such a work should have ever been written. Abundant and strong the evidence is that the Theory of *Development* is the *only consistent* Theory of *Romanism,* yet it has never, I believe, been propounded so distinctly, or worked out so elaborately, as by the author of this volume. Your theologians have sighed for it, and have cherished it secretly; but they have been afraid to own it publicly. This Theory has had many a Copernicus among you, but he is its Newton; and we would indulge a sanguine hope, that the cause of truth will be promoted in due time by the unreserved manner in which *this* Theory, this *only* Theory of Romanism, has been stated in this Essay.

It would be an interesting study, scarcely any more so, to trace the progress of this doctrine of development through the writings of your Romanist Divines. It showed itself timidly at first, like a stream half hidden in the sand. Here and there it flowed in a feeble rill in your earlier theology. But it has gradually become broader and deeper, till at length it has swollen into the main navigable flood, and become the ecclesiastical Tiber of the Eternal City. The reason of this progress is clear. In the middle ages, when the Scriptures were less accessible to the world, and when the works of the Fathers

of the Church were buried in MSS. in libraries, it was not difficult or dangerous for the Church of Rome to plead her cause by an appeal to Scripture *and* Antiquity. The documents to which she referred were in her own hands, and scarcely in any other. Nor can I doubt that many of her Divines who made this appeal *believed* that they had good ground for doing so. But in course of time the Scriptures were more studied, and the works of the earlier Fathers were more and more diffused through the medium of the press; and then it became evident to those who examined the matter, that if the cause of Romanism was to be maintained, it must look for aid of a very different kind from that which it had formerly pressed into its service. If you will allow me, I will submit to you some proof of this assertion.

About a hundred and eighty years ago our learned Bishop Stillingfleet * thus wrote to an Englishman who had been perverted to Romanism, Mr. John Serjeant †: "I see the Roman Church asserts that things may be *de fide* in *one age* which were not in another; at least Popes and Councils challenge this; and this is the *common* doctrine there, and others are looked on as *no members of their Church who assert the contrary.*" By way of comment on

* Appendix to Rule of Faith. Lond. 1666. p. 39.

† Concerning whom see the note to the recent excellent edition of Archbishop Bramhall's Works, ii. p. 358.

this statement of the Bishop, I would remind you of Leo X., and his famous bull *Exsurge Domine** against Luther, wherein the Pope *condemns* as heretical, the assertion "that it is not in the power of the Church or Pope to constitute articles of Faith." Before that time Cardinal Cusanus† had affirmed that "Scripture is modified and variously understood according to change of times, so that at one period it is to be expounded in one way according to the practice of the Church, and that on the change of practice its sense is changed also." So, again‡, Gregory of Valencia says, "the same things have not always been believed *explicitly;* but divers points, in course of time, have been *made manifest* and believed," and Austin§ of Ancona, "the Pope may make a new Creed, multiply articles of faith, and place more points under each article than were before." And thus the celebrated Salmeron‖ declares that "God has not given all things to all men, and that every

* Bullarium Romanum, vol. v. p. 489.

† Cusan. ad Bohem. Epist. 2. "Scripturas esse ad tempus adaptatas et variè intellectas, ita ut uno tempore secundum currentem universalem ritum exponerentur, mutato ritu iterum sententia mutaretur." See also the discussions in Sarpi's History of the Council of Trent (Brent's Translation, 1676, p. 149. 170—173).

‡ iii. 96.

§ "Novum symbolum condere; novos articulos supra alios multiplicare." August. Triumph. de Ancona, Summ. de Eccl. Pot. q. 59, art. 3.

‖ "Non omnibus omnia dedit Deus, ut quælibet ætas suis gaudeat veritatibus quas prior ætas ignoravit." Salmeron. Dis. 57, in Ep. ad Rom.

age should enjoy *its own truths* which *were unknown to preceding generations;*" and we are assured by Stapleton that "the Church learns *many things** from the Holy Spirit, which she has not been taught by Christ." In fact, Christianity, with many of your Divines, admits as much of *discoveries* as Chymistry. Even your Bellarmine, zealous as he was for tradition, does not scruple to say that every doctrine rests on the authority of the *existing* Church †; and that the Church of latter time has not only power to *explain* and *declare*, but to *constitute* those things which belong to faith ‡. Bossuet also, vehemently as he protested (as I shall show hereafter, for your divines are not always consistent) *against* the Doctrine of Development when taught by a Protestant, did not scruple to say that "the Church of the first three centuries left many things to be cleared afterwards both in its doctrine and practice§." For

* Relect. iv. 9. 1. art. 1. ad 4. "Suggerit *multo plura*" . . . "*adhuc* docet; nec a solo Dei verbo, sed a voce loquentis Ecclesiæ pendet Fides."

† "Omnium dogmatum firmitas pendet ab authoritate *præsentis Ecclesiæ*." De Sacr. ii. 25. See also de Eccl. Mil. iii. 10. So also Gretser. Def. c. 10. lib. iii. de Verbo Dei, p. 1450. Per Ecclesiam intelligimus Pontificem Romanum, qui pro tempore Ecclesiæ naviculam moderatur: and Def. c. 1. lib. i. de Verbo Dei, p. 16. Id solum pro verbo Dei veneramur quod nobis Pontifex ex cathedrâ Petri tanquam supremus Christianorum magister omniumque controversiarum Judex definiendo proponit.

‡ De Summo Pontifice, iv. c. 2—4.

§ Exposition of Christian Doctrine, i. p. 9. This passage was erased by the Doctors of the Sorbonne. See Wake's edition of it in Bishop Gibson's Tracts, iii. p. 10.

example of this, Scotus * tells us, that "before the Lateran Council, under Innocent III., transubstantiation was not an article of faith;" and Vasquez † says that "we cannot deny that the practice of administering both kinds in the Sacrament continued in the Latin Church to the times of Thomas Aquinas;" and the Church of Rome teaches in her Canon Law "that many things were allowed, before the Gospel became clear, which are now forbidden—for instance, the marriage of the Clergy," she says, "is not prohibited by the Law, the Gospel, or the Apostles—but it is strictly interdicted by the *Church* ‡."

I will not trouble you with many citations to prove the growth of this theory in *modern* times. The author of the "Essay on Development," appears to think that your famous Count Joseph De Maistre was one of its advocates §. I doubt this. De Maistre taunts ‖ Bossuet and Fleury (for I find that your

* Scotus in 4 Sentent. Dist. xi. 9. 3. "Ante Lateranense Concilium (A.D. 1215) Transubstantiatio non fuit dogma fidei."

† "Negare non possumus etiam in Ecclesiâ Latinâ fuisse usum utriusque speciei, et usque ad tempora S. Thomæ durâsse." Vasq. in 3 Disp. 216, c. iii. n. 38.

‡ Jus Canon Decret. Pars II. c. xxvi. Qu. 2. Sors non aliquid, p. 884, ed. 1839.

§ Mr. Newman says (p. 27), "The view on which it" (his own Essay) "is written has at *all times*, perhaps, been *implicitly* adopted by Theologians" (*i. e.* of *Rome*), "and I believe has recently been illustrated by several distinguished writers of the continent—such as De Maistre and Möhler."

‖ Du Pape, liv. i. cap. i. p. 250, ed. Paris, 1841. See ibid. p. 617.

Divines often quarrel), the one for asserting that the Infallibility of the Pope dates only from the Council of Florence, the other for maintaining that it was invented by Cardinal Caietanus; and he is very angry with Bossuet for the "long list of errors of Popes which he made with the zeal of a centuriator of Magdeburgh." On the other hand, De Maistre contends that "there is *nothing new* in the Church of Rome, and that she will *never* believe any thing which she has not believed always." He had no notion of the doctrines of the Church having been set up in *moveable* types; he boldly affirmed that her faith had been *stereotyped* once for all in the Apostolic times; and that if people could not see all Roman doctrine in that of the primitive Church,—it was the fault of their *eyes* *.

But passing from De Maistre, we find, as you know, a zealous partizan of the Doctrine of Development in the late celebrated Bavarian Professor of Theology, Dr. Möhler. His work on symbolism †,

* Mr. Palmer, in the Appendix to his learned Work on Development, has quoted some extracts from De Maistre's "Du Pape," which show that he had not made up his mind whether "Saint Pierre avait une connaissance distincte de l'étendue de sa prérogative;" but, on the whole, he decidedly clings to *tradition*. See his Du Pape, iv. p. 491. "Nos docteurs protestent et prouvent *qu'ils* n'enseignent que *la foi des Apôtres*."

† The first edition of which was published at Tübingen in 1832; the fifth at Munich in 1838; in which year and place the author died. An English translation of this work has been published by Mr. James Burton Robinson, 2 vols. Lond. 1843, from which I quote.

or on the dogmatic differences of Protestant and Romanist Churches, deserves to be carefully read. The earlier portion of it breathes a delightful spirit of Christian charity; and if the author did not commit the inexcusable error of substituting *Rome* for the WORLD—*Urbem pro* ORBE—and of limiting to the *present* Romish communion, which is only a *part*, and a very *corrupt part*, of Christendom, what the Divine Head of the Church has given to the *whole* Catholic Church of *all times*, he would, I think, have gained the sympathy and respect of all Christian readers in this portion of his work. He expounds the Theory, of which I am now speaking, in the fifth chapter of his first part. There he says that "the theory of the unity of the doctrine of the Church with that of Scripture is applicable to its *substance* only, and not the *form* *." "The original doctrine, as the human mind variously evolved it, expanded itself in a much altered form; it remained the original; and yet it did not †." "The word, after Christ's ascension, existed for the world in no other form than in the faith of the Lord's disciples, whose kernel in Peter He therefore called the rock, whereon His Church was in such a way to be built that the powers of hell should never prevail against it. But after the Divine word had become human faith, it must be subject to all mere human destinies ‡." "All

* Tom. ii. p. 49. † P. 50. ‡ P. 49.

the developments of the dogmas of the word and its morality, which can be considered as formal acts of the whole body, are to be revered as the sentences of Christ Himself*." "The faith † is ever old and ever new," and the Church by whose energy it is developed "must be infallible."

The reader will, I think, rise from a perusal of Dr. Möhler's volume with the feeling that the author writes obscurely and vaguely: and the reason of this is obvious; he was conscious of the difficulty under which he laboured. Can he espouse Development without discarding Tradition? He strives earnestly to do so; but cannot. He therefore absorbs Tradition into Development. Tradition, according to Dr. Möhler, is not definite or fixed, but it is the living word energizing in the hearts of believers. It is the sap of the tree ascending upward, and causing it to put forth buds, branches, and leaves. In fact, Tradition loses all its *traditive* character in Dr. Möhler's hands; and instead of practising the strict fidelity of the *Historian* it luxuriates in all the exuberant imaginativeness of the *Poet*.

One of the most elaborate theological works that have been produced in the present day in the Church of Rome is a course of Lectures delivered by the Padre Perrone, Professor of Divinity in the College of Jesuits, at Rome. You are aware that it has been circulated very widely in your country and on the

* P. 37. † Pp. 8. 10.

continent generally, although written in Latin and consisting of about three thousand very closely printed large octavo pages. The Roman Professor has not the boldness of Mr. Newman, nor even of Dr. Möhler. He therefore exhibits the Church of Rome entangled in a complex web of inconsistencies. Perhaps he was too near the steps of the infallible chair, and was dazzled by the excess of light in which it is invested. Whatever the reason—he has attained a most oracular ambiguity of speech. He will not abandon an iota of the old mediæval traditional Theory, and yet he is determined to have all the benefit of the newer doctrine of Development. With Cardinal Baronius he affirms that all the modern claims of the Papacy are to be found in the records of the Primitive Church *; and yet he will contend with Möhler for its evolutionary and expansive power. It shall be rigid and yet elastic; stationary and yet progressive; land and yet sea. To say nothing at present of his defence of Romish Doctrine on the ground of antiquity, I would only lay before you one or two passages from his work, of an opposite character.

"The faith (says he) which was contained in general words, as it were in a kernel or a seed ("*in nucleo aut semine*"), was evolved by degrees, as occasion required, and enunciated in precise formulæ †."

* Pp. 883—930, ed. Paris, 1842.

† De Locis Theologicis, vol. ii. p. 847, Part I. c. iv. He there refers to Möhler (tom. ii. ch. v. § 40), "Ubi (says Perrone) hoc argumentum egregiè evolvit."

The following words will be read with a painful interest :—

"Since (says the same Roman Professor *) the objection, viz. that the Church of Rome has added new articles to the Creed, has ever been urged against her by Protestants, among whom Mr. Newman holds a distinguished place, who, in his Treatise on Romanism, censures the Catholics for substituting the confession of Pius IV. for the Creeds which the Church of England receives, I rejoice to be able to stop the mouths of our adversaries with the *profound theory of Dr. Möhler.*" Having cited some of the paragraphs from Möhler's work, which I have already adduced, he adds, "If the Church of England †, as Mr. Newman asserts, has remained *content* with the *three Creeds*, it is because she is destitute of infallibility, and has never been able to condemn any heresy ; which is the case with all *sects.*"

Such is the language of the Professor of Theology in the Jesuit College at Rome. Whether he will see cause to rejoice that Mr. Newman has now adopted Dr. Möhler's "profound Theory," and has developed it in its full amplitude, remains yet to be seen. Of this I am sure, that with the *rise* of this Theory, that of Primitive Tradition, to which the Professor clings so fondly, must *fall* :—

"Non bene conveniunt, neque in unâ sede morantur."

* Perrone, p. 855, ed. Paris. † Pp. 845—847.

The Church of Rome is now in a very critical position. She desires to be like the last day of the Athenian months, ἕνη καὶ νέα, both *new and old* at the same time. But she cannot remain where she is. The new moon must appear. And the Essayist has been the first to announce it in a bold and audible voice. Will she thank him for so doing? At present he has served only to remind us of her *Variations;* to call our attention to the fact, that some of her Doctors are for Tradition, some for Development, some for both. Is this consistent with truth? Is this unity? I begin to think, that you will ere long have cause to rue his conversion. You now rejoice in your conquest, but time will show whether you will not regret it. You have been dazzled by his erudition and ability; but it may perhaps prove fatal to your cause. He has fascinated the Papal Tarpeia with the jewels on his arms; he has been received by her within the walls of the Roman citadel; it remains now to be seen, whether he will not crush her with their weight.

Believe me,
My dear Sir,
Yours faithfully, &c. &c.

LETTER II.

"And Nahash the Ammonite answered them, On this condition will I make a covenant with you, that I may thrust out all your right eyes." . . . 1 Sam. xi. 2.

Such, my dear Sir, is the condition on which the Church of Rome consents to make a covenant with us. If we are willing to extinguish the Eye of Reason which God has planted in our minds, and which He enlightens with heavenly radiance, we may have peace with the Roman Nahash, and take an oath of allegiance to him. You will remember that Saul and Samuel and the people of Israel did not approve of the Ammonite's proposition; that their indignation was greatly excited by it, and that they arose as one man to assist the men of Jabesh-Gilead to whom the overture was made, and that by the aid of the Divine Spirit they fought valiantly against the Ammonites, and routed them utterly.

After a few preliminary observations, I purpose to show in the present letter that the Church of Rome

is ready to receive us into her communion, on the condition of our sacrificing our REASON.

It is impossible to admire adequately the mercy of Divine Providence, in affording means and opportunities for embracing the truth to all who are willing to accept it; and permit me to add, that this goodness has shown itself in an especial manner in the present day to the Church of England, in overruling the religious controversies of the times, so as to display clearly, to all who will consider the matter, the soundness of the foundation on which *her* doctrinal system is based. She affirms* that "HOLY SCRIPTURE containeth all things" (that is, all doctrine of supernatural truth) "necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein nor may be *proved* thereby is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of *Faith*, or be thought requisite or necessary to *salvation*:" and

* Art. vi. See again Art. xx. "It is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's Word written; neither may it so *expound* one place of Scripture, that *it be repugnant to another*. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, yet as it ought not to decree one thing *against* the same, so, *besides* the same, ought it not to enforce any thing to be *believed* for necessity of salvation." Again, in her Ordinal, the following question is put to the person to be ordained *Priest or Bishop*:—"Are you persuaded that the holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation, through faith in Jesus Christ; and are you determined out of the said Scriptures to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach nothing as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scripture?"

reasonably concluding from the nature of the case, and from Christ's special promise of presence and guidance to His Church, that it is impossible that the whole Church, and particularly the whole Church in the ages nearest to that of the Apostles, should have been in ignorance of any cardinal article of Christianity, she rightly teaches that nothing is to be regarded as a doctrine of Scripture, or to be inculcated as such, which is contrary to the interpretations of Scripture contained in the THREE CREEDS, which "ought" (she asserts) "to be thoroughly received and believed*." Whatever article of doctrine has not been deduced from Scripture by the ancient Doctors of the Church, or can be proved to have been unknown to the first ages of Christianity, she allows not to be taught as an article of *Faith* †.

Hence, while other Churches are now drifting on a troubled ocean of uncertainty—while some are tossed about by the veering gusts of private interpretation, or by the no less capricious blasts of the arbitrary will of the Papacy, the bark of the Church of England remains securely anchored to the rock of Scripture by the two cables of Reason and Antiquity.

Allow me here to observe—by way of preamble to my argument—that the very event, to which you

* Art. viii. And our Reformatio Legum Eccles., p. 6, thus emphatically speaks of the *Creeds*: "Summa fidei capita . . . in *symbolis* breviter comprehensa, in *exponendo Sacras Literas ob oculos perpetuò habeantur, ne quid contrà ea aliquandò interpretemur.*"

† Canon. 1571, de Concionatoribus, "*Imprimis*," &c.

adverted in your last letter to me as a triumph to the cause of Romanism—I mean Mr. Newman's fall —appears much more likely to prove an occasion for the more clear display of the weakness of Rome, and of the strength of the Church of England. Let me endeavour to explain this.

Mr. Newman's conversion to Romanism was accompanied, as I have said, by the publication of his "Essay on Development," which is intended to declare the grounds of his change. But it so happens, that in this volume he has inflicted a severe wound on the Papacy. Its very name is ominous against it. What is Development? The explication and evolution of something that was wrapped up in embryo. St. Paul gives us a very pertinent illustration of this process with respect to Doctrine. He speaks of a Mystery. What is a Mystery? A thing concealed*, *undeveloped.* He speaks of a mystery of *Iniquity*, or, rather, of lawlessness (*ἀνομία*). He says that *this* mystery is already at work†, like leaven, secretly fermenting the mass in which it is; and, he adds, that in time it will be *developed*‡.

Let us apply this to the fundamental doctrine of

* Μυστήριον. The Lexicographers explain this word by *ἀπόῤῥητον, ἄῤῥητον, arcanum.*

† 2 Thess. ii. 7, *τὸ μυστήριον ἤδη ἐνεργεῖται τῆς ἀνομίας.* Compare Apoc. xvii. 5, *ἐπὶ τὸ μέτωπον αὐτῆς ὄνομα γεγραμμένον,* Μυστήριον. The word "MYSTERIUM" was formerly inscribed on the papal tiara; whence it was removed by Pope Julius II., A.D. 1503—1513.

‡ *ἀποκαλυφθήσεται.*

Romanism, viz., the Pope's Supremacy. "On this doctrine," says Cardinal Bellarmine, "the whole cause* of Christianity" (he means *Romish* Christianity) "depends." Let us now turn to the Essayist. He allows (indeed, with "his well-stored mind, after many years' application to Theological Literature," to use the Dublin Reviewer's words, he could not do otherwise; for as Æneas Sylvius, afterwards Pius II., said, "for the first three centuries the see of Rome was not much regarded†") that in the first ages of the Church this doctrine existed only in a *seminal form*—that is, it was a *mystery*. "First," says Mr. Newman, "the power of the Bishop awoke, then the power of the Pope" (p. 165). "*Nor would a Pope arise*, but in proportion as the Church was consolidated" (p. 145). "Apostles are harbingers of Popes" (p. 124). Again, "Christianity developed in the form first of a Catholic, then of a Papal Church‡" (p. 319); that is, the Papacy is an abandonment of

* De quâ re agitur cum de Primatu Pontificis agitur? brevissime dicam; *de summâ* rei Christianæ. Vol. i. p. 494, ed. 1577.

† Æn. Sylv. Ep. ad Mayer, 288, p. 802. "Ante Nicænum Concilium parvus respectus habebatur ad Ecclesiam Romanam."

‡ Some curious details are given by the learned Benedictine, Dom de Vaines (in his Dictionnaire Raisonné de Diplomatique, Paris, 1774, p. 161), on the gradual *development* of the Pope's titles. In the four first centuries the title of Pope (Papa) was usually given to Bishops indiscriminately. In the ninth century the Bishops of France were reprimanded by Pope Gregory IV. for calling him Papa and Frater: Gregory VII., in the eleventh century, was the first who restricted the term Papa to the Bishops of Rome. The title, Vicar of Peter, is not earlier than the ninth century: in the thirteenth they limited

Catholicity; so that, in fact, the primitive ages of the Church—the purest, the Apostolic times—did not hold *that* doctrine on which "the cause of *your* Christianity depends!" And thus you are brought into the company of those *heretics*, of whom Tertullian* writes, that they were "wont to say that the Apostles were not acquainted with *all* Christian doctrine, or that they did not declare it fully to the world; not perceiving that by these assertions they exposed Christ Himself to obloquy, for having chosen men who were either ill-informed or else not honest." Let me remind you also, my dear Sir, of the words of a greater than Tertullian. Our Blessed Lord Himself says to His Apostles, "*All* things that I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you†;" and that the "Holy Spirit should *teach them all* things, and guide them into all truth, and bring all things to their remembrance whatever He had said unto them‡;" and He orders them to *proclaim* to the world what they had heard from Him,—"What I tell you in darkness that speak ye in light; and what ye hear in the ear that preach ye upon the house-tops§." "*Teach all* nations *all things* whatsoever I have commanded you‖." And accordingly St. John witnesses, that Christ's true disciples "have

that of Vicar of Christ to themselves; it had been previously borne by other Bishops.

* Præscr. Hær. 22.

† John xv. 26.

‡ John xiv. 26.

§ Matt. x. 27.

‖ Matt. xxviii. 20.

an unction from the Holy One, and know *all things*;" and St. Paul, as a faithful steward of his Lord's house, the Church, declares that "he has kept *nothing* back from his hearers;" that he "uses great plainness of speech," and "not being rude in knowledge, has been thoroughly made manifest to them in all things," and has not shunned to declare unto them "*all the counsel* of God*;" and he plainly intimates that he should not have been "pure from their blood"—that is, he would have been guilty of destroying their souls—if he had done so: and he warns all men against building "hay and stubble on the only foundation which is laid," and says, that "though an angel from heaven preach unto them any thing *beside*† what he had preached unto them, and they had received from him, let him be accursed."

See then, my dear Sir, how completely you are convicted of heresy by your new convert! For, since, as he allows, the doctrine of the Pope's supremacy and infallibility was not developed in the Apostolic age, it cannot be any part of "the whole counsel of God;" it cannot be an article of the faith "once for all (ἅπαξ) delivered to the saints:" and since *this* doctrine is the *foundation* on which the whole Roman system is based—and since it is even destructive of the

* Acts xx. 20. 27.

† Gal. i. 8, ἐὰν εὐαγγελίζηται παρ' ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα. Παρ' ὅ, "*besides* what," &c. These, the words of the original, are very observable; and are much more conclusive against Development than the expressions of the authorized version, "*any other Gospel* than"——

"only foundation which *is* laid*"—let the advocates of that system consider whether they are not liable to the anathema pronounced by St. Paul on all who teach any thing as Christian doctrine *beside* (παρ' ὃ) what had been preached by him, and received by the Church from him.

Since, also, the Papal Supremacy is a thing of such large and lofty consequence; since, as Bellarmine affirms, it consists in no less than giving laws† to all Prelates and Princes of the world; and since it was only concealed in embryo in the Apostolic age, may it not perhaps be that very μυστήριον ἀνομίας, that secret principle of *lawlessness*, of which the Apostle writes‡?

Destructive of all other Law, the Papacy requires its own will to be received as the only Law. When we have quenched the Rational light, by which we are distinguished from the rest of the creation; when we have rendered Scripture a dead letter; when, by mutilating the Sacraments, or by undermining the evidence on which they rest, we have obstructed the channels of God's grace to man;

* 1 Cor. iii. 11.

† De Pontifice, iv. 24. v. 6. See below Letters XII. XIII.

‡ Let the language of St. Paul be compared with that of the Essayist, p. 165,—"The question is this, whether there *was not* from *the first* a certain *element* at *work*, or in existence, which, for some reason or other, did *not at* once *show itself* upon the surface of ecclesiastical affairs, and of which events in the fourth (qu. the seventh?) century are the *development*." Such is his description of the Papacy. Undesignedly he seems to identify it with the μυστήριον of St. Paul.

when we have buried Public Prayer in the sepulchre of a dead language; when we have stopped up the Apostolic wells, and made all Episcopal jurisdiction to flow solely from the Pope; when we have obscured the venerable records of the Primitive Church—that is, when we have overthrown all the foundations of social Christianity—then we may build the Papacy on their ruins;—

Tantæ molis erit Romanum condere Papam * !

May we not justly say, concerning your architects of the Papacy, what Tertullian writes of the heretical teachers of his day, "They undermine *our truths*, in order to build up *their errors;* their work rises by destruction of truth†?"

In proof of these assertions, let me beg you to observe, my dear Sir, the synthetic process by which the Essayist *creates* the Papacy. The first thing to be destroyed is *Reason;* and since this act of intellectual murder would not be an agreeable object for contemplation, he veils it over with a specious name,

* "The doctors of this school (says Bishop Bull, Defence of the Nicene Creed, Preface, § 8), have no scruple to build their pseudo-Catholic Creed on the ruins of the true Catholic Faith. Therefore, the Holy Scriptures are to be condemned as obscure; the holy Fathers, Bishops, and Martyrs of the Primitive Church are to be charged with heresy; so that, *by all means*, the doctrine and authority of the degenerate Roman Church may be preserved intact. And yet, blessed God! they execrate *us* as accursed Chams, as contemners and revilers of the venerable Fathers of the Church, and vaunt themselves as faithful and reverent followers of Antiquity!"

† Tert. Præscr. Hæret. § 42. "Nostra suffodiunt ut sua ædificent: opus ipsorum venit de veritatis destructione."

and calls the destruction of Reason the "*Supremacy of Faith!*"

Let me invite your attention to his chapter on the "*Supremacy of Faith.*" "This principle (says he, p. 327), when brought out into words, is as follows: that *belief* is in itself *better than unbelief;* that *it is safer to believe;* that we must begin with believing, and that *conviction will* follow; that, as for the reasons of believing, they are for the most part implicit, and but slightly recognized by the mind that is under their influence; that they consist moreover rather of presumptions and *guesses, ventures after the truth, than of acccurate proofs; and that probable arguments are* sufficient for conclusions which we even embrace as most certain, and turn to the most important uses. On the other hand, it has ever been the *heretical principle* to *prefer reason to Faith* *, and to hold that things must be considered true only so far as they are proved."

Here appears to be the secret of the process by which the author has allowed *himself* to fall a captive into your hands. Not by any logical deductions of the intellectual faculty, but by the unintelligible influences of a mysterious sentiment, he appears to have been brought into his present position. His case seems to resemble that of those under the agency of incantation or magnetism. It reminds one of those mesmeric *passages*, as they are termed,

* The Italics in this passage are mine.

which are sometimes exhibited to wondering spectators in the saloons of your French capital. First the hand droops, then the eyes swim, then they are closed, then the head sinks on the shoulder, and the *patient* is in a trance. So the Essayist. He has been fascinated by some indescribable spiritual magnetism. His rational eye is clouded; his conscience is lulled to sleep; his Bible, his Ecclesiastical History, his own writings, drop one by one from his hands; and he falls into a swoon, *which he calls Faith!*

Would that some angel voice would sound in his ear,—"What meanest thou, O sleeper*?"

Reason, my dear Sir, is a Divine thing: τὸν νοῦν ὁ Θεὸς φῶς ἀνῆψεν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ—Reason is the light which God has kindled in the soul†, said the heathen philosopher. "Res Dei Ratio," as Tertullian‡ well expresses it, and, as he adds, "God who purposed, disposed, and ordered nothing without Reason, wills that all things should be treated and considered with Reason;" and true Faith, so far from being opposed to Reason, or inconsistent with it, is the consummation, the perfection, of Reason. Hence our blessed Lord Himself, "in § Whom are *hid* all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge," willed Himself to be called Λόγος, or Reason. Not that we imagine in any respect that the objects of the spiritual world—such as the Trinity of Persons in one God, the Incarnation

* Jonah i. 6.
‡ De Pœnitentiâ, § 1.
† Aristot. Rhet. iii. 10.
§ Col. ii. 3.

of the Second Person, or the regenerating influences of the Third, are discoverable by the *rational* faculty; but what we mean to say is, that *rational* man is the proper subject for the indwelling of that Faith which *does* discern them; and that *unless* man were *rational*, he could *not* discern them by Faith.

Christianity does not beguile or compel us to believe the doctrines which it propounds to us; it does not shun examination, but courts it; it appeals to Reason, and *commands* us to use it. It is, indeed, quite true, that the Christian religion having once convinced us of its own truth in general,—having persuaded us that God is infinitely wise, good, and true, and that it comes from Him, it *then* requires a hearty and unqualified assent to the special doctrines, which Reason itself shows us to be grounded on its fundamental principles. For example, we prove by Reason that the Scriptures are the word of God; and by Reason we deduce certain articles of doctrine from the Scriptures: some of these articles far transcend the reach of our rational faculty; they are not objects of our Reason, but of our Faith. But then Reason must have *preceded*, in order for Faith to exist. The Poet beautifully describes the kindling of the hero's arrow in the sky and its melting away, as it were, into the pure ether:—

> "—— Volans liquidis in nubibus arsit arundo,
> Signavitque viam flammis, tenuesque recessit
> Consumta in ventos;" ÆN. v. 525.

The arrow became fire, but the shaft was shot from a bow on earth. So it is with Reason. It kindles into Faith, through the influence of Revelation and of the Spirit of God, but it requires an impulse from the string and the bow of the human intellect. The arrow cannot be fired without being discharged into the air. Such was the agency which produced the Faith of Apostles, and Evangelists, and Martyrs.

How strange, therefore, is it that the Essayist should have endeavoured to persuade us that the first converts to Christianity were beguiled in the following manner into belief of it*! He thus writes, "It is the very objection urged by (the infidel) Celsus, that Christians were but parallel to the credulous victims of jugglers or of devotees, who itinerated through the pagan population. He says that some do not even wish to give or to receive *a reason* for their faith, but say, '*Do not inquire but believe,*' and '*Thy faith will save thee;*' and 'A bad thing is the world's wisdom, and foolishness is a good.' How does Origen answer the charge? by denying the fact, and speaking of Reason as proving the Scriptures to be Divine, and Faith after that conclusion receiving the contents, as it is now popular to maintain? Far *from it; he grants the facts alleged against the Church and defends it.*"

How strange, I say, is it that the Essayist should have hazarded such assertions as these with the fol-

* P. 329.

lowing passages of Scripture before him! "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." "Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind." "I speak as to wise men, judge ye what I say." "Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God." "How is it that even of your own selves judge ye not what is right?" "Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you."

With such precepts as these sounding in their ears, the first Apologists of Christianity *could* not have followed the course which the Essayist says they *did*. It is very extraordinary that he should have specified the objections of the sceptical Celsus, and have affirmed that they were *allowed* to be true by Origen, when the very *contrary* to this had been long ago truly established by one of our greatest English Theologians, Dr. Barrow. Let me commend the following passage from his works to your perusal *. "It was anciently objected by *Celsus* (says he) and other adversaries of our religion, that Christianity did exact from man a *bare groundless Faith;* did impose laws *uncapable of proof;* did inculcate the rule, *do not examine* or *discuss*, but *only believe;* that it debarred inquiries, slighted the use and improvement of *Reason*. The ground of his accusation was surely a *great mistake*, arising from their not distinguishing

* From his Sermon, "On the Truth and Divinity of the Christian Religion," vol. ii. p. 189, ed. 1683.

that belief, whereby we embrace Christianity itself in the gross, from that belief, whereby, in consequence of the former, we assent to the *particular doctrines* thereof, especially to such as concern matters *supernatural*, or exceeding the reach of our natural understanding to penetrate or comprehend. For, as to the first kind of belief, whereby we embrace Christianity itself as true in the gross, I say, it is in *no* wise *required* on *such terms*. Our religion doth not obtrude itself upon men in the dark, doth not bid them *put out their eyes*, or to shut them close, or even to wink; but it rather *obliges* them to *open them wide*. It requires not, yea it *refuses*, ordinarily, a sudden and precipitate assent: admitting no man, capable of judging, to the participation thereof, till, after a competent time of instruction, he declares himself to *understand* it well, and *practically* to *approve it*."

Such is Barrow's language concerning the treatment which Reason receives from *Christianity;* what treatment it has received from *Popery*, is, my dear Sir, a very different thing. *If* Popery were Christianity, then indeed all the objections of Celsus would be true. Then, indeed, the infidel might justly assert, that all our religion is a mere ψιλὴ πίστις, a bare, groundless faith, and that all our teaching consists in this, "Do not inquire, but believe." This indeed your theologians allow. For example: "The Catholic Church" (he means the *Roman* Church), says your

De Maistre *, "is not argumentative in her nature. She believes without disputing; for faith is a creed of love, and love disputes not. The Catholic *knows* that he *cannot be deceived;* and that if he could, there would be no more revealed truth, nor assurance for man on the earth." If this be so, I should be glad to know what is the use to which a Roman Catholic turns his Reason: does he not find it a very inconvenient incumbrance?

Now for a word concerning Origen. To adopt the Essayist's language, "How does Origen answer the charge of Celsus?" 'He grants the fact alleged against the Church by Celsus, and defends it,' is the Essayist's reply. Nay: but let Origen speak for himself. I cite from his third book against Celsus †. Celsus (says he) thus writes: "We see jugglers exhibiting their legerdemain in the streets, but never coming into the company of wise men, nor daring to act there; but where they behold children, and slaves, and a mob of silly folk—there they intrude themselves, and display their feats." "But look," says Origen, "how Celsus *calumniates* ‡ us, comparing us to mountebanks, itinerating through the populace. What do *we* like them? What do we even like his own Pagan Philosophers? They are not scrupulous about their scholars: any one may hear them who lists. . . . But *we*, as much as we can, *pre-examine*

* Du Pape, p. 250. † Lib. iii. p. 141, ed. Cant. 1677.

‡ συκοφαντεῖ ἡμᾶς.

the minds of those who come to us, and make them *rehearse* to us, before we admit them to our communion; and then we receive them in two classes, the one of those recently admitted and not yet baptized, the other of those who have professed their resolution to live and believe as Christians."

Hear Origen again *; "Celsus affirms that we say 'this life's wisdom is bad, and that foolishness is good;' but, I reply, he *calumniously misrepresents* our words, not stating them as they are uttered by St. Paul †, "If any one of you *appears* to be *wise* in *this world*, let him become foolish, that he may become wise." "Therefore" (adds Origen) "the Apostle does *not* say that wisdom is folly with God, but that the wisdom of *this world* is folly." And again ‡, Celsus says, "we teach men not to examine but believe." . . . "But," argues Origen, "what is more *rational* than to believe in God §? Let your Philosophers boast of their investigations; not less || *research* than theirs, to say the least, will be found among Christians concerning their articles of belief." He allows, and very justly, that *all* men cannot examine the grounds of every particular doctrine of Christianity; and he maintains that the miracles of mercy wrought by Christ entitle Him to be heard as a teacher sent from God, and that the doctrines ought to be received "for His works' sake ¶." But what is there

* Lib. i. p. 11. † 1 Cor. iii. 8. ‡ Ibid. p. 8. § P. 10.
|| οὐκ ἐλάττων ἐξέτασις τῶν πεπιστευμένων. p. 9. ¶ P. 9.

here to justify Mr. Newman's assertion that Origen *allowed the validity* of the objection urged by Celsus, that Christians *believed* without *Reason?* Nothing; —but very much to prove the *contrary.*

Thus your new convert is seen to have acted very unfairly toward the venerable Apologists of Christianity. Surely, if you wish well to its cause and to your own, you must regret his reception among you. I must say a few more words on the teaching of the ancient Church, strangely misrepresented by the Essayist, concerning the uses of Reason in Religion. If the enthusiastic ecstasies and fanatical ravings of Montanism had been orthodox Christianity, then, and then only, would his assertions have been true; for the Phrygian dogma was, "Imbibe our words, and you shall thirst no more: no inquiries shall vex you. Reason will be swallowed up in Faith *." But not so the Catholic teachers. The author of a work inserted among those of St. Athanasius †, expressly declares, that of all the *heresies* which have crept into the Church none is more pernicious than that which says, "Embrace unhesitatingly (ἁπλῶς) what we deliver ‡; and which *calls* a blind assent to

* Tertull. de Resurr. Carnis, ad fin.

† St. Athanas. Opera, ii. 581, ed. Benedict. πρὸς τοὺς κελεύοντας ἁπλῶς πιστεύειν τοῖς λεγομένοις. See also the authorities in Mr. Palmer's Essay, pp. 9. 15. 19.

‡ δέχεσθέ, φησιν, ἁπλῶς τὰ λεγόμενα, καὶ μηδεὶς ἐξεταζέτω τί πρέπον ἐν αὐτοῖς ἢ τί ἀπρεπές; καὶ πίστιν ὀνομάζει τὴν ἀβασάνιστον ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀστάτοις καὶ ἀναποδείκτοις ἐπὶ βλαβῇ συγκατάθεσιν.

dogmas without demonstration by the sacred name of *Faith.*" This is the heresy of the Essayist. It is observed by Eusebius *, "that this was the principle of the arch-heretic Apelles;" and Lactantius is very strong in his censures upon it†.

It has been ever the "heretical principle to *prefer Reason* to *Faith*," says the Essayist, who prefers *Faith* to *Reason*. But here, I think, the speech of the wise ‡ man may justly be applied; "*All* the works of the Lord are good; so that a man cannot say, This is worse than that; for in time they shall *all* be well approved;" and even the heathen poet teaches us, in those delightful verses where one of the two shepherds is for comparing the respective merits of the four seasons of the year,—that

> κρίνειν οὐκ ἐπέοικε θεήϊα ἔργα βροτοῖσι,
> πάντα γὰρ ἱερὰ ταῦτα καὶ ἀδέα . . .
>
> *Man it befits not God's works to compare;*
> *For all are full of holiness and joy.* BION, VI. 9.

Let us not therefore speak, my dear Sir, of *preferring* Reason to Faith, or Faith to Reason; but let us *exercise* them *both*, with care and thankfulness, in the offices assigned to them, and about the objects proposed to them, respectively, by the same Divine

* Euseb. v. 13. μὴ δεῖν ἐξετάζειν ὅλως τὸν λόγον.

† Lactant. ii. 8. "Oportet in eâ re maximè in quâ vitæ ratio versatur sibi magisque confidere suoque judicio ac propriis sensibus niti ad investigandam et perpendendam veritatem quam credentem alienis erroribus decipi tanquam ipsum rationis expertem."

‡ Ecclus. xxxix. 33.

Creator, Who is the Author and Giver of them both.

It is strange, that the Essayist would have us believe, that *St. Augustine**, of all persons in the world, was an advocate of blind assent to articles of faith. Like every judicious man, St. Augustine did indeed teach that there are two sources of human knowledge, *Reason* and *Authority;* and that in *Education*, Authority is prior in time, though, as he expressly says, Reason is prior in fact†. Oportet discentem credere; sed oportet edoctum judicare. He who learns must listen to Authority, because his Reason is immature; but he who has learnt must use his Reason; and it is the duty of Authority to call upon him to do so; and let it be observed, that children, not yet arrived at years of discretion, in obeying Authority are in fact obeying *Reason*, not their own, but the Reason which guides others, namely Parents and Tutors, set over them to seek and procure their good; and nothing can be more in accordance with *Reason* than that the tender Reason of youth should lean on the mature Reason of riper years. So that the exercise of Authority is grounded on Reason.

Indeed no one has treated this subject more clearly than St. Augustine. He had an especial call to do

* P. 332.

† St. Aug. de Ordine, ii. 9. "*Tempore* Auctoritas, *re* autem Ratio prior est."

so, for he was taunted by his Donatist adversaries with laying too much stress on *logical deductions*. He was too good a dialectician (they said) for a Christian Teacher*. This was *their* opinion. But Augustine thought that *all* God's gifts ought to be used in His service; and that *Reason* was one of the best. While on the one hand he refuted the ancient Rationalists, who taught "nihil esse *credendum*, quàm quod possit evidenti ratione demonstrari†," that nothing is to be believed but what can be proved by Reason; on the other hand, to a friend, Consentius —a Priscillianist of Spain—who broached the opinion which your new convert has revived, "veritatem rei divinæ ex *fide* magis quam *ratione* percipi oportere," that the truth of Religion is to be imbibed rather by *Faith* than by *Reason*, he replied in an admirable letter. "Certain things there are (says he‡) appertaining to salvation, which we are not able as yet to understand by Reason; and in *these things*, Faith should precede Reason: so that the heart may be prepared to receive the light of heavenly Reason. This itself is a work of Reason. It is reasonable, that for the reception of certain great truths, which we cannot yet understand, Faith should precede Reason; yet the Reason which persuades us that this is reasonable is itself antecedent to Faith.

* S. Aug. c. Crescon. i. 16. "Quasi Dialectica Christianæ non congruat veritati." See Hooker, III. viii. 8.

† De Util. Cred. c. 1. ‡ S. Aug. Epist. cxx.

And he who understands by sound Reason what he before only believed by Faith, is to be preferred to one who as yet only *desires* to understand what he believes; and if he thinks that those things, which ought to be understood by Reason, are only to be viewed by Faith, he knows not the true use of Faith. I know not how they (he adds) who are content with Authority, and go no further, and lead good lives, can be called *happy*, as long as they exist in this world, though I believe that, such as their life is here, such will be their lot hereafter."

In your own country, my dear Sir, many writers of celebrity have abused their Reason to destroy the use of it in matters of Religion. Thus, in the words of Tennemann *, Peter Huet, Bishop of Avranches, "employed *Scepticism* as a means of converting Protestants." In his book on the Imbecility of the Human Understanding, and in his Evangelical Demonstration, he commends the process of reasoning, which invalidates all philosophical principles previous to or independent of Revelation. Thus he prepared the way for the reception of a *living infallible guide* †. For how should Revelation be understood, since Reason is hopelessly incapable, unless some unerring Judge is always at hand? Thus Rome rises

* Tennemann, Hist. of Philosophy, § 343.

† "It is well known that the Jesuits, who were favoured by Huet, have employed this method to lead Protestants into the Romish Communion." Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. Cent. XVII. Sect. i. Part I. note.

on the ruins of Reason. The "Supremacy of *Faith*," is in fact the Supremacy of the *Pope*.

Let me take occasion to observe an inadvertency into which the Essayist has been betrayed, in his zeal for Faith opposed to Reason, concerning the true character of the philosophy of the New Academy. He would brand Carneades and his followers as mere sceptics. "Arcesilas and Carneades (says he *) are known to have innovated on the Platonic doctrine by inculcating an *Universal Scepticism*." This is the objection of the Freethinker Collins, to whom the Essayist is too often in a very dangerous proximity (as we shall see), and was refuted more than a hundred years ago by Dr. Bentley, who showed that the Philosophers of the New Academy did not pretend to go beyond what was probable; but that their *probable* (verisimile) was to them as much a dogmatic principle, as the *truth* (verum) of any other School to its Sectaries. Indeed, as Bentley † shows, Cicero, the greatest Roman follower of the New Academy, *dogmatizes* as boldly in some of his Philosophical Treatises ‡, as ever Theophrastus did among the Peripatetics, or Chrysippus among the Stoics. The

* P. 78.

† On Freethinking, 243—250, ed. 1743.

‡ Ibid. p. 250, e. g. "His De Officiis, Tusculanæ, De Amicitiâ, De Senectute, De Legibus; in which, and in the remains of others now lost, he declares for the Being and Providence of God, for the Immortality of the soul, for every point (in ancient philosophy) that approaches to Christianity."

Philosophers, therefore, of the New Academy cannot be cited as Sceptics, nor do they afford any aid to the New Theology which would * annihilate Reason to make way for Romanism, and would make us Infidels if we will not be Papists.

It is, I repeat, a most painful thing to observe, into what company you are brought by the Theory which the author of the "Essay on Development" propounds, and which, as I have before said, is the only true Theory of Romanism. The Essayist's allegations here are the same as those of a sceptical writer, who made much noise in this country by a book published anonymously a hundred years ago †, with the title, "Christianity not founded on Argument." Christianity, said he, is not based on Reason, but on an inward persuasion, or presumption rather, which he calls Faith. The results to which such a Theory leads ought, I think, to excite in the minds of all reflecting persons among you, the most serious

* "'Tis most certain," says Dr. Bentley, in the work just quoted, p. 111, "that to propagate Atheism in Protestant countries has been a method prescribed and made use of by Popish emissaries. . . . Infidelity and indifference to religion must needs pave a way for Popery; while zeal and flame are all on one side, and coldness and mere ice on the other. Let those authors look to it then; and let your Government look to them."

† Lond. 1742. This author agreed also with Romish writers in the opprobrious terms he applied to Scripture, which he called "*manuscript authority*," "*paper revelation*," "*dead letter*." His book was refuted by Dr. Benson, "On the Reasonableness of the Christian Religion," 1743; and Archdeacon Randolph, "The Christian's Faith a Rational Assent," 1744.

misgivings concerning the soundness of the cause which is to be maintained by such means. The Reason being enslaved, it necessarily follows that the Will must succumb too. As a necessary consequence of what the Essayist calls the *Supremacy* of *Faith*, the following doctrine is propounded.

"The Papal See has in all cases a claim on our *obedience* *." And the benefits of this implicit *obedience* to the Papacy are described as follows †:—"As *obedience* to *Conscience, even supposing Conscience ill-informed, tends to the improvement of our moral nature*, and *ultimately of our knowledge*, so obedience to *our Ecclesiastical superior* may subserve our growth in illumination and sanctity, even though he should command what is extreme or inexpedient, or teach what is external to his legitimate province."

Here, Sir, is one of the foundations on which the Papacy is built,—Obedience to Conscience, as it is called, however *erring* the conscience may be. Now *our* ethical instructors have ever taught *us*, that if our Conscience is *ill-informed*, we ought *not* to *obey* it, but to *inform* it *aright;* and that, if we obey it *when* it is *ill-informed*, so far from improving our moral nature, we do in fact *degrade* it, and disobey its Divine Author, Who has not only given us a Conscience, but a Rule whereby to *regulate* it, and Who orders us to *apply* this rule to its government, and warns us that we shall be judged hereafter accordingly as we have

* P. 124. † P. 125.

done so or not. *But* your new convert says that, "Obedience to Conscience, even suppose Conscience ill-informed, tends to the *improvement* of our moral nature, and ultimately of our knowledge." Why, my dear Sir, scarcely any flagrant *crime has* ever been perpetrated where Conscience was not pleaded as an excuse for it. "In nomine Domini," as the old proverb says, "incipit *omne malum.*" The Jews *thought* they were doing God service when they persecuted the Apostles. They obeyed their Conscience; but it was ill-informed. Did they thus "improve their moral nature?" If this were the case, then Saul's moral nature must have been greatly damaged by his conversion! He ought never to have condemned his past life, or to have branded himself as a blasphemer and injurious, and the chief of sinners—because he persecuted the Church of Christ; he ought rather to have said that because he obeyed his Conscience (which was doubtless the case), he therefore had done what tended to the "improvement of his moral nature, and ultimately of his knowledge!" We must henceforth learn to consider the baptism of St. Paul by Ananias as great a calamity as that of your new convert by Father Dominick!

Obedience, Sir, to conscience, is a great Christian virtue: but then it must be under the guidance of right Reason. Do not, however, imagine that I suppose right Reason to be an *adequate Rule* of

Obedience. No, the only adequate rule of human Obedience is * God's Law, however made known to us: but right Reason is necessary for the discovery and *application* of this Law: and he who obeys his Conscience, when by the exercise of his Reason (which he is bound to use) he can discover that by so doing he is disobeying God, Who is the Author of his Conscience, and of the Law by which it ought to be regulated, he, I say, who in such a case as this *obeys* his Conscience instead of *regulating* and *reforming* it by the Divine Law, sins against his Reason and against his Conscience, which, let us remember, are talents *lent* to us by God, talents lent to us to *use*, but not to *give away*—for *we* "are not our own" but God's—and he sins against the Law of his Conscience; that is, he sins against himself and against God.

Let me also add, that Obedience to a *human* superior is a great and necessary virtue. "Obey them that have the rule over you," is the command of Scripture. But then we must be quite sure that *they*, who command, in any given case, *have the rule over us* in that particular; and we must be satisfied that, by obeying *their* commands, we should not be *withdrawing* our Obedience from some other power, to whom it is due in the *first* instance, and thus be

* As is clearly stated by St. James iv. 12: εἷς ἐστιν ὁ Νομοθέτης ὁ δυνάμενος σῶσαι καὶ ἀπολέσαι. The Lawgiver, who is able to save and destroy, is ONE only—GOD. See also Bp. Sanderson, Prælect. iv.

not obeying those who really have the rule over us, but *rebelling* against them. And we may be sure of this, that since Almighty God is the Author of *all* power, Civil and Ecclesiastical, and since our obligation to obey an *earthly* authority is derived *solely* from its being God's representative to us in that behalf, and since God's commands cannot be at variance with each other, we may, I say, be satisfied that when any earthly superior commands what is clearly *opposed* to the will of God, he is *not* entitled to our Obedience. He *ceases* to be God's representative to us, as far as that command is concerned, and we should be guilty of disobeying the Divine Author of all Power if we "called any man Master" in such a case as this. Even, therefore, if the Pope *had* "the rule over us," which is *not* the case; yet, considering the nature of many of his commands, we should be guilty of rebellion against God, if we allowed that "the papal See has in all cases a claim on our obedience."

Observe, I repeat, Sir, the principle on which the Essayist constructs the Papacy; and now let me beg you to remark, that the Papacy has laid precisely the same foundation for itself. He assumes certain false principles as if they were true, and on them erects the Papacy: the Papacy assumes itself to be true, and requires us to receive the *same* false principles which the Essayist assumes.

Conscience, says he, is to be obeyed however ill-

informed it may be; "the Papal see has in all cases a claim on our obedience:" hence then our Conscience is to resolve itself into the Pope's will: and, however ill-informed it may be in doing so, yet it is our Conscience and it is to be obeyed; that is, we are to pay blind Obedience to the dictates of the Pope; and, though "he should command what is extreme or inexpedient," this "Obedience will subserve our growth in illumination and sanctity." This is the *initial* point from which your Roman doctors go backwards to the destruction of the Law of Conscience and of Right Reason, by which that Law is to be discovered and applied. Thus, for example, Cardinal Bellarmine says, "If the Pope should so far err as to *command Vices* and to *prohibit Virtues*, the Church would be bound to believe that Vices are good and Virtues are evil; unless she will sin against her Conscience *."

You see then, Sir, that the Essayist proceeds from certain principles, and arrives at the Papacy; Cardinall Bellarmine proceeds from the Papacy, and arrives at the Essayist's principles. The *course* traversed by both is the same; the only difference is, that they go over it in an inverse order.

But not only have we had these principles laid down by our great Romish Doctors, we have seen them put in *practice* by the most favoured agents of

* Bellarmin. de Pontif. iv. c. 5. "Si autem Papa erraret præcipiendo vitia vel prohibendo virtutes, teneretur Ecclesia credere vitia esse bona et virtutes malas, nisi vellet contra conscientiam peccare."

the Papacy. You are well aware that the Society of Ignatius of Loyola—I mean the Society of the Jesuits—is founded on this very basis of implicit Faith and Obedience to a human Superior. Sacrifice your Reason: resolve your Faith into the decrees of the Pope: subject your will unreservedly to his dictates: these are the first axioms and postulates of Jesuitism. Hear the language of its Founder: "Although (says he) we confess that *all* Christians are subject to the Roman Pontiff as their Head, and Vicar of Jesus Christ, yet, for the greater humility of *our* Society, and for the perfect mortification of every member of it, we have judged it highly useful that each of us should be bound by a special *Oath*, that whatever the Roman Pontiff should command, conducive to the edification of Souls, and the propagation of the Faith, we should be bound to execute forthwith, without any demur or excuse *." Again, in the Constitutions †, "Let us strain every nerve to pay this virtue of Obedience to the Supreme Pontiff, so that in all things, to which Obedience can be extended with love, we may, with the greatest alacrity, obey *his* voice as if it were that of Christ Himself." And again ‡, "The Society subjects all its own Sense and Will to Christ our Lord, and *His Vicar*." Again, what the *nature* of the obedience

* Pauli III. Confirmatio Instituti, Antwerp, 1635, p. 10. "Illico, sine ullâ tergiversatione aut excusatione exequi teneamur."

† Pars VI. cap. 1. ‡ Pars VII. cap. 1.

required is,—that it is to be blind, irrational, and mechanical,—is evident from the comparisons by which it is pourtrayed; "Let every one," say the Constitutions *, "persuade himself that they who live under Obedience ought to allow themselves to be borne and carried by Divine Providence acting in the person of their Superiors; that they ought to permit themselves to be moved about as if they were a corpse, which suffers itself to be carried and swayed in any way you please; or as if they were a staff in the hand of an old man, which allows him to use it wheresoever and for whatsoever he likes." And in another place, "He is to be like soft wax in the hands of his Superior, to take what form he pleases." And, as if this was not enough, it is expressly said that the Superior may bind the Members of the Society to commit *mortal sin* †, "in case it shall be *very conducive* to the good of an individual, or of the whole. And in this case it is commanded, that the

* Const. VI. cap. 1. "Quicquid nobis injunctum fuerit obeundo: omnia justa esse nobis persuadendo, omnem sententiam ac judicium nostrum *cæcâ* quâdam *obedientiâ* abrogando."

† Pars VI. c. 5. "The Constitutions are *not* to bind to mortal sin, NISI Superior id in Nomine Domini Nostri Jesu Christi, vel in virtute Obedientiæ, juberet, quod in rebus vel personis illis in quibus judicabitur quod ad particulare uniuscujusque vel ad universale bonum multum conveniet, fieri poterit, et loco timoris offensæ succedat amor et desiderium omnis perfectionis." How different is St. Augustine's language, contra Mendac. c. 7. "Ea quæ constat esse peccata, nullo bonæ causæ obtentu, nullo quasi bono fine, nullâ velut bonâ intentione facienda sunt;" and St. Paul's, Rom. iii. 8.

person bound to sin should feel *love* and *desire* of all perfection, instead of any fear of offence!"

Such, my dear Sir, is the homage which the Papacy demands from the World. Men are to become like wax, and to be moulded by its hand into whatever form it pleases they would assume; they are to *immolate* * themselves (I use the word of Ignatius) as victims to its Power, to throw themselves down prostrate, to be crushed by its sacred wheels! they are to destroy their Reason, their Conscience, and their Will; that is, they are to annihilate the Divine image within them, and to become passive, motionless, lifeless, and (must we not add, when the Divine spirit is extinct?) *loathsome* corpses; they are to cease to be men, and to become senseless, sapless staves, as blind as the eyeless beggar who wields them!

Such are the principles of the Society of Ignatius; and let me remind you that these principles, as now stated, have been solemnly sanctioned by the Roman Pontiff, who has approved and confirmed the Constitutions of Ignatius by a special bull †, and has enrolled the Author of them himself among the Saints of Rome; and the Pope in the bull of canoni-

* Ignat. Epist. de Obed. p. 267, ed. Antwerp, 1635. "Obedientia est holocaustum quo totus homo *immolatur*."

† Gregory XIII. Literæ Apostolicæ quibus Institutum, Privilegia et Constitutiones confirmantur, 1582. "Constitutiones et statuta, qualiacunque sint, ea omnia confirmamus et approbamus."

ration * asserted, that "the ineffable goodness of God had raised up the spirit of Ignatius of Loyola, who gave himself up to be formed by Divine guidance to found a Society for the maintenance of the Papal Power!"

We shall be led hereafter to consider the practical results of these principles in their bearing on the peace of Nations, on the security of Governments, and on the lives of Sovereigns. Your own history affords, as we shall see, a sad commentary upon them: and since we are commanded in Scripture to judge the tree by its *fruits*, we must ask ourselves the question, What must the *root* of the Papacy be, when such is the produce which hangs upon its *branches?*

Before I conclude this Letter, you will excuse me,

* Urbani VIII. Literæ Apostolicæ Canonizationis S. Ignatii Loyolæ, 1623, p. 320. The author of the "Essay on Development," p. 438. thus speaks of the "Exercitia Spiritualia" of the Founder of the Jesuits:—"St. Ignatius' Spiritual Exercises are among the most approved methods of devotion in the modern Catholic Church; they proceed from *one of the most celebrated of her Saints*, and have the praise of Popes, and of the most eminent masters of the spiritual life. A Bull of Paul the Third's 'approves, praises, and sanctions all and every thing contained in them;' indulgences are granted to the performance of them by the same Pope, by Alexander the Seventh, and by Benedict the Fourteenth. St. Carlo Borromeo declared that he learned more from them than from all other books together; St. Francis de Sales calls it 'a holy method of reformation;' and they are the model on which all the extraordinary devotions of religious men or bodies, and the course of missions, are conducted. If there is a document which is the authoritative exponent of the inward communion of the members of the modern Catholic Church with their God and Saviour, it is this work."

I hope, if, from considering the results of the doctrine of Implicit Obedience, I revert now for a few minutes to the question of the *Supremacy* of *Faith*, in order to exhibit the consequences of *this* principle also, when reduced to *practice* by the Papacy.

The following document is a public and an authoritative one; it has even taken its place among the "Symbolical Books" of the Church of Rome, and I cite it from one of the most recent editions of the dogmatical Collections * of that Church. You will see from it to what awful conclusions the Papal principle of Implicit Faith leads, and to which it *has actually led;* and after having perused it, you will, I think, be induced to inquire whether the Papacy does not claim "dominion over your Faith," and whether it be not liable to the wo denounced by our Blessed Lord upon those who "make the Word of God of none effect by their traditions;" and "teach for *doctrines* the commandments of men:" whether it does not come under the sentence of condemnation uttered by the Apostle, "Though an angel from heaven preach any thing unto you besides what we have preached unto you, let him be accursed †." Let me also be permitted to ask you, whether in submitting to such a system as this, you are not disobeying the Divine will; whether, if I may so

* Libri Symbolici Ecclesiæ [Romano-]Catholicæ, editi a Streitwolf (a Roman Catholic). Götting. 1838. Tom. ii. p. 343.

† Gal. i. 8.

speak, in tying up your own Reason and Conscience in the Napkin of the Pope's will, and burying it in the ground, you are not incurring the judgment which will be pronounced on the *unprofitable* servant at the great day.

But to proceed to our citation. It is from the

Confessio Romano-Catholica in Hungariâ Evangelicis publicè præscripta et proposita; i. e. from the Roman Catholic Confession publicly prescribed and propounded* to Protestants in Hungary and Germany on their reception into Communion with Rome.

I quote from it the following Articles:—

"I. We confess that we have been brought from heresy to the Roman Catholic faith by the diligence and aid of the Fathers of the Society of Jesus.

"II. We confess that the Pope of Rome is Head of the Church, and *cannot err.*

"III. We confess and are certain that the Pope of Rome is Vicar of Christ, and has plenary power of remitting and retaining sins according to his will, and of thrusting men down into hell (*in infernum detrudendi*).

"IV. We confess that whatever *new* thing the Pope of Rome *may have instituted* (*quicquid Papa institu-*

* About the year 1673. See Streitwolf's Collection of the Confessions of the Church of Rome, Göttingen, 1838, p. li; and Mohnicke's work on the same subject, and his volume "Zur Geschichte der Ungarschen Fluchformulars:" Greiswald, 1823.

erit novi), whether it be in Scripture or out of Scripture (*sive infrà sive extrà Scripturam*), is *true, divine,* and *salvific;* and therefore ought to be regarded as of *higher* value by lay people than the *precepts of the living God* (*ideoque a laicis majoris æstimari debere Dei Vivi præceptis*).

"V. We confess that the Most Holy Pontiff ought to be honoured by all with *divine honour* (*honorari divino honore*), with *more* prostration than what is due to Christ Himself.

"VI. We confess and affirm that the Pope is to be obeyed (*audiendum*) by all men in all things, without exception, and that whoever contravenes his decrees is not only *to be burnt without mercy,* but to be delivered, *body and soul,* to *hell.*

"VII. We confess that the reading of Scripture is the source of heresy, and the fountain of blasphemy.

* * * *

"XI. We confess that the Pope has the power of *altering Scripture,* of *increasing* and *diminishing* it, according to his Will.

* * * *

"XIV. We confess and affirm that they who communicate under *one* kind receive the entire Christ, and that they who communicate in *both* kinds receive nothing but bare bread.

* * * *

"XVIII. We confess that the Blessed Virgin is

the Queen of Heaven, and that her Son ought to do whatever she bids Him.

* * * *

"XXI. We confess that *Holy Scripture* is imperfect, and a *dead letter*, until it is explained by the Supreme Pontiff, and permitted by him to be read by lay people.

"All these things we do confess and affirm sincerely and openly; . . . and we swear in the presence of God and His angels that we will never recede either through fear or favour from the salvific and divine Roman Catholic Church."

Need I add any thing to these monstrous and appalling articles, in further proof of the consequences of the doctrine of the Supremacy of Faith, as actually developed in practice by the Church of Rome? I think not.

I remain,
My dear Sir,
Yours faithfully, &c. &c.

LETTER III.

Δῖνος βασιλεύει, τὸν Δί' ἐξεληλακώς.
ARISTOPH. NUBES, 1454.

"Jove is deposed ; and Dinos holds his throne."

SUCH, my dear Sir, is the language of the Son in the Aristophanic Play, who has renounced the ancient Faith for the new Philosophy, which had been recently imported by the Sophists into Athens: and such may be your reply when you are asked for a brief account of the theory presented to us by the Author of the "Essay on Development," and put in practice by the Church of Rome. Δῖνος βασιλεύει, τὸν Δί' ἐξεληλακώς. Reason is dethroned ; Free-will is dethroned; Scripture is dethroned ; Antiquity is dethroned. And who rules in their stead? Δῖνος, Development ; a wondrous Spirit, with "an Infallible Developing Power," (as the Essayist calls him, that is, the Pope,) enshrined, bombyx-like, in the centre of the spiral, and endued with most prodigious powers of evolution.

Having shown in my preceding Letter that the Papacy requires us to sacrifice our *Reason* and our

Will, I now propose to prove that the next victim which it dsmands at our hands is *Scripture*. For this purpose *Scripture*, like *Reason*, is to be decried, disparaged, vilified. Yes, and, let it be spoken with reverence, it is to be treated as its Divine Author was by the servants of Caiaphas, and the soldiers of Pilate,—first blind-folded, buffeted, and spit upon, and then put to death.

The language of the Essayist concerning Holy Scripture is, as I shall show, entirely in accordance with that of some of your most distinguished Theologians. He says, that "Scripture needs completion*," that "we have tried it, and that it disappoints†," "that it has its‡ unexplained omissions," "that all that our Lord said and did, His actions, miracles, parables, replies, censures, are evidences of a legislation in germ afterwards to be developed§;" that "it suggests great questions which it does not solve‖." These are precisely the terms in which many Romanist Divines speak on the same subject. *St. Paul* commends Timothy for studying the Holy Scriptures even from a *child*, and he¶ teaches us that they are able to make us wise unto salvation. *But*, in order to make us believe that if we would believe any thing, we must believe in the Pope, your *Romish Doctors* strain every nerve to persuade us that Scripture is imperfect, uncertain, ambiguous,

* P. 100. † P. 126. ‡ P. 140.
§ P. 105. ‖ P. 98. ¶ 2 Tim. iii. 15.

and unintelligible; and that the reading of it is unnecessary, and unprofitable, if not dangerous. For example, "Vain is the labour," said Cardinal Hosius*, a Papal Legate, and President at the Council of Trent, "which is spent on Holy Scripture; for Scripture is but a creature, and a beggarly element." And Ludovicus, a Canon of the Lateran, in a speech at the same Council, "Scripture is only *lifeless ink:*" and Pighius, in his third book of Controversies†, calls it a Mute Judge, a "*Nose of wax*, which allows itself to be pulled this way and that, and to be moulded into any form you please;" and the Church of Rome, so far from regarding the reading of Scripture as necessary, has by the mouth of her Supreme Head, Pope Clement XI.‡ *condemned* as *false* and *scandalous*, the proposition, "that the Christian Sunday ought to be hallowed by reading of the Holy Scripture," and that it is "criminal to prohibit Christians from such reading," and "that to take away from them the New Testament is to close against them the mouth of Christ; to interdict them the use of Light; and to subject them to a kind of excommunication." These assertions, I say, have been condemned by your Infallible Pontiff as *false* and *scandalous;* and the bull in which he condemns them

* De Expresso Verbo Dei, i. p. 624.

† Contr. iii. de Ecclesiâ.

‡ In the Bull Unigenitus, Jus Canon. Appendix, p. 143. Lips. 1839.

is every where received by your Romish hierarchy, and is appended to one of the most recent editions of your Canon Law*.

The "Essay on Development" has not left the Romanist allegations, concerning the uncertainty and insufficiency of Scripture, where it found them. The Author has adduced, what to some may appear a strong reason for those assertions. He would have us believe that the "Canon of the New Testament was not formed till the *fourth and fifth centuries;*" that is to say, that it was not decided till then what books are *canonical, i. e.* are of authority in establishing articles of Faith; and that none of the Fathers of the first three centuries knew what Scripture was; indeed, that it was not before the end of the fourth, or the beginning of the fifth, that it *was* decided by the Church that certain books were of authority in matters of doctrine.

He thus writes †, "On what ground do we receive the Canon as it comes to us, but on the authority of the Church of the *fourth and fifth centuries?* The Church *at that era decided*—not merely bore testimony, but passed a *judgment* on former testimony—*decided,* that certain books were of authority. We receive that judgment as true, that is, we virtually apply to a particular case the doctrine of her *Infallibility,* and in proportion as the cases multiply, in

* That of Leipsic, 1839, vol. ii. pt. 2, p. 143.
† Pp. 142, 143, and 160.

which we are obliged to trust her decision, do we approach, in fact, to the belief that she is infallible." "The Creed, the *Canon* *, the Papacy, Œcumenical Councils, all *began to form* as soon as the empire relaxed its tyrannous oppression of the Church."

If, now, the Canon of Scripture was not settled till the fourth or fifth century, we must allow (as the Essayist intends us to do) that Scripture *cannot* be the *Rule of Faith;* for if it were so, the first three centuries, which did not know what books were Scripture and what were not, must then have been without a Rule of Faith; which is absurd. There must have been therefore some *other* Rule. And what was that? "The authority of the Church;" is the reply, which, by deciding what is Scripture, gave to Scripture the force which it possesses. And since the first three centuries did not know what was Scripture, and since we all allow that certain books *were* received as Scripture in the *fourth* and fifth centuries, and have ever since been acknowledged as Scripture, it is evident that we must admit the reasonableness of the Theory of Developments; for we have here a remarkable *example* of it, in the elevation of certain books more than three hundred years after they were written, to the dignity of inspired compositions. Your Divines go on to argue, that since the Scriptures owe their authority *as Scriptures* to the Church of the fourth century, therefore the existing *Church*

* P. 167.

has power to *make* that to be the Word of God which was not so before: or as a Romanist Divine expresses it, "The Church has authority to invest writings with canonical authority, which they do not possess by virtue of themselves or their author*."

Besides, some Rule of Faith is *necessary;* and since the Scriptures have failed us as a Rule, we must look elsewhere for guidance; and since also we have acknowledged *one* great *development*, viz. the elevation of certain books, by the authority of the Church, to the dignity and authority of *inspired compositions*, which had never been before so regarded, having, I say, thus once crossed the Rubicon and passed into the *region* of *Development*, we are now on the high road to *Rome*. One great development being acknowledged, others naturally follow in their rear. If the Scriptures, written in the *first* century, do not *emerge* as such till the *fourth*, why should we be surprised that we have to wait for the ἔκνευσις or ebullition of a Pope till the *seventh*? And if the Church has power to endow *writings* with Divine authority, why should she not communicate the same to *persons?* If she can *make* a *Bible*, why not also make a *Pope?*

What then is the *fact?* Is it *true* that the Canon of the New Testament was not settled till the fourth or fifth century, and that, therefore, the Christians of the first three centuries did not know what were

* Pighius de Ecclesiâ Hierarch. iii. 3. See below, p. 101, *note*.

the words of the Holy Spirit to the Church? Such is the allegation of your new convert, and it is remarkable, that we have here in his pages the assertion—only greatly exaggerated—of the two Freethinkers*, Toland and Collins, concerning the Canon of the New Testament; and I must here desire you to observe, that the best refutation of Romanist objections to the authority of Scripture and the Primitive Church may often be found in the works written by our English Theologians against modern *Deists*. As an illustration of this assertion, I may mention, that, in order to destroy the authority of Scripture, Collins affirmed that no Canon of the New Testament was made till about *sixty* years after the death of Christ. He was content, you see, with allowing the Church to have had a Canon of the New Testament in the *first* century, whereas your new convert will not permit her to possess one before the end of the *fourth*. So much more liberal is the Freethinker of the two: But what was said to Mr. Collins by our Divines a hundred years ago?

Your love of English literature may have made you acquainted with the Remarks of Dr. Bentley, under the name of *Phileleutherus Lipsiensis*, on the

* Toland's Amyntor, 1698, passim, especially pp. 47. 56. 64; and Collins' Discourse on Freethinking, 1713. The assertions of Toland were refuted by Dr. John Richardson (of Emmanuel College), in his work, entitled "The Canon of the New Testament Vindicated," Lond. 3rd edit. 1699; those of Collins by Bentley, in his "Remarks," &c. Cambridge, 8th edit. 1743.

work of the Freethinker, and you have a translation of them in your language. If, then, you will turn to Dr. Bentley's book, you will read* as follows: "*All* the books of the New Testament were not *written* till the year of Christ XCVII, and that is *above* LX *years after* the *death of Christ.* What sense is there, then, in this complaint, that the books were not *collected,* before they were *made!* All the books we now receive as canonical were written occasionally between the years LII and XCVII. And during that interval of XLV years every book, in the places whither it was sent, or where it was known, *was immediately as sacred* and *canonical* as ever it was after. Nor did the Church *loiter* and *delay* in making a Canon or collection of them; for in two years after the writing of St. John's Gospel, the Evangelical Canon was fixed; and within X after that an Epistolical Canon was made; quick enough, if it be considered that they were to be gathered (whither they had been directed) from so many and so distant parts of the World."

So writes Phileleutherus, in his Reply to our English Freethinker: how astonished would he have been to hear from an English Theologian that the Church had loitered and delayed in making a Canon, for more than *three hundred years!*

But you may say that you want *proofs* of the truth of Dr. Bentley's statement: that you have the

* P. 86, 8th edit. 1743.

Essayist's allegation on the other side; and you cannot suppose it possible that he can have been guilty of so flagrant a misrepresentation on so important a subject, as must be the case, if Bentley's assertion is *true*.

Besides, it is quite true that you have not only the Essayist's assertion on the other side, but you have also that of some of your most famous Roman controversialists. Thus, for instance, Bishop Milner, in his End of Controversy*, boldly asks, "Was the abrogation of the First Rule of Christianity deferred till the Canon of Scripture was fixed at the *end* of the *fourth* century?"

I shall now proceed to refute this most unwarrantable assertion, which shows what the fate of Scripture is likely to be if it should ever be left to the care of Rome. I fear it would fare as ill in her hands as in those of Infidels. But *Dî meliora piis!* Allow me, then, to submit the following facts to your consideration:—

Dr. Milner and Mr. Newman affirm that the Canon of the New Testament was not made till the end of the fourth century. They do not say *where* it was made in the fourth century; but I take it for granted they refer in their own minds to the council of Laodicea†, which met about the year A.D. 360,

* P. 143, ed. Dublin, 1830, *Ninth* edition: countless reprints have appeared of this book since 1830; and it is said to have perverted many to Romanism. The assertion I have quoted from it is a sample of its veracity.

† Concil. ed. Bruns, p. 408; it is there placed at A.D. 352. Binius,

and made a catalogue of the books "which are to be read in the Church," both of the *Old* and *New* Testament. If the Canon of Scripture was made before that Council, much more was it made before the "end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth century."

Let me now ask one question, Did the Council of Laodicea intend to *make* any books canonical, which were not so before? Certainly not: look at the words of the decree,—"It is unfit (says the Council) that *Private* Hymns should be used in the Church, or uncanonical books be read, or any, except the canonical Books of the Old and New Testaments*." It then proceeds to enumerate them.

You perceive then, my dear Sir, that the Synod does not pretend to settle the Canon of Scripture at all; no, this would have been *actum agere:* it speaks of the canonical writings as already *known*, and decrees that only canonical books should be read. The injunction that only canonical books should be read, shows that every one could tell what canonical books were. It is evident, then, that the Church of the fourth century, so far from having "*decided*," as the Essayist says†, "what books were of authority," bears palpable testimony that this question had been already decided. The Laodicene decree was not an *enactment*, but a *declaration*.

ap. Labbe Concil. i. 1522, places it before A.D. 325. The Canon in question will be found in Bruns' Ed. p. 80.

* Canon LIX. † P. 160.

But to prove this more fully. First, I observe that some persons are accustomed to point to the Council of Laodicea in the fourth century, as one of the first which declared what books were canonical. But this is an incorrect view of the subject. Many Councils sate before that of Laodicea: and many, we doubt not, published catalogues of Books of Scripture; but their Acts are lost, and we know nothing of them. Cardinal Baronius says*, "Who can doubt, nay, who will not affirm, and that with the greatest safety, that a Canon of Scripture was published at the great Council of Nice?" The Cardinal asks a very reasonable question: for St. Jerome, in his preface to the Book of Judith, refers to the Nicene Canon; and there seems to be little doubt that if the Decrees of all the early Councils had survived, we should find there abundant evidence of the reception of the books of the New Testament, as the Church now receives them.

But next I would remark, that the writers of the New Testament addressed their works for the most part to *public communities*, to nations, cities, or churches; and that they gave strict instructions that the works so written should be *publicly read* in the Churches to which they were sent. St. Paul's solemn language, "I adjure you by the Lord, that this Epistle be *read* to *all* the holy brethren†,"

* Annales ad A.D. 325. See Bellarmin. de Verbo Dei, i. x. § 2.

† 1 Thess. v. 27.

spoken of *one* Epistle, the first which he wrote, is a *general* authoritative precept, dictated by an inspired Apostle, which could not be disobeyed; and the injunction "If *any man* obey not our word by this Epistle, note that man*," is another proof that the Apostolic Epistles were to be made known to *all*, and to be the rule of faith and practice of *all;* and we know as a matter of *fact* that these directions were complied with; and that the books of the New Testament *were* read† in all Christian assemblies, as soon as they were written, and have so continued to be read to the present hour.

Why, then, do Bishop Milner and the Essayist speak of the Canon of Scripture not being settled till the fourth century? The books of the New Testament were given by the Holy Spirit into the hands of the Church, they were forthwith publicly read: *this* was their *canonization.*

Let us apply the Essayist's principle to profane authors. The works of Horace and Martial were not published at once, by their respective authors, but at intervals of several years. *Now* that they are collected together in one volume, we have what may

* 2 Thess. iii. 14.

† Coloss. iv. 16. 1 Thess. v. 27; and Justin Martyr, Apol. xi., says, that on Sundays the Christians met in religious assemblies, wherein "the memoirs of the Apostles and writings of the Prophets were read;" and Tertullian de Anima, c. 9, states, that "among the solemn exercises of the Lord's Day the Scriptures were read (inter Dominica solennia—Scripturæ leguntur)." See also Apol. c. 39, Cogimur ad *divinarum literarum* commemorationem.

be called a Canon of Horace and Martial. But how was this formed? Did a junta of grammarians sit down at a table and *decide* what books were to be received as making it? No: the Canon of Horace and Martial *made itself*, by the *general reception* of their books, as the works of their respective authors, as soon as they were written. So, much more the Canon of the New Testament made itself by the *public usage* of the Church in all parts of the world. But, it may be asked, can we show that the books of the New Testament, which *we* receive as inspired, were so received as *soon as they were written?* Let us examine this point.

Ruffinus, a Roman Presbyter in the fourth century*, gives a catalogue of the books of the New Testament, as, "according (says he) to the tradition of our *ancestors*, they are *believed to have* been inspired by the Holy Ghost, and delivered to the Churches of Christ, and as we have received them from our Fathers." He had no idea that it was reserved for his age to *make* a Canon of Scripture: that century had nothing to do but to *acknowledge* the Canon delivered to it by its predecessors.

Such was the language of Ruffinus in the West: let us now hear the Eastern Church speaking by the mouth of St. Cyril, "Meditate (says he, in his Catechetical Lectures†) only on the books which are

* In Symbol. p. 26, ad calc. S. Cyprian. ed. Fell.
† IV. xxxiv.

read in the Church. The *Apostles* and *primitive Bishops who delivered them to us* were wiser than thou. O thou child of the Church, revere the laws of the Church!"

And to proceed higher still. Tertullian *, writing in the second century, has quoted all the books of the New Testament, except the Second Epistle of St. Peter, the Third of St. John, and perhaps the Epistle of St. James; and he expressly says that it was the characteristic of *heresy* to *reject* † certain books of Scripture: but how, I ask, could heresy be said to *reject* what had never been *received* by the Church? It never could have been a mark of heretics to repudiate Scripture, if Scripture was not known as Scripture by the orthodox.

But to ascend higher. The New Testament divides itself into two portions, viz. the Gospel History with the Acts; and the Epistles with the Apocalypse. The *four* Gospels were received *as inspired*, immediately they were written; and no others. This is beyond all doubt. Your great Bishop and Martyr of Lyons, Irenæus, the scholar of Polycarp, the disciple of St. John, thus writes: "There are four

* See Bishop Kaye's Tertullian, 294. 308.

† De Præscript. Hæret. xvii. "Ista hæresis non recipit quasdam Scripturas, et si quas recipit, non recipit integras;"—a passage of great importance, as showing the *definiteness* of the *Canon*, and of the *text* of the books which form it. In the same treatise, Tertullian speaks of the books of the *New* Testament as forming a known *Sylloge*, or *Corpus*, in the same manner as those of the old. "Marcion *Novum* Testamentum a *Vetere* separavit."

quarters of the globe, and there are four winds of heaven, and the Catholic Church is diffused over all the earth, and the Gospel is the Pillar of the Church, and the Breath of Life; therefore the Word, the Creator of all things, Who sits on the Cherubim and upholds all things, when He revealed Himself to men, gave us the *fourfold* Gospel." And he proceeds to apply the Vision of Ezekiel of the four animals to the four Evangelists *.

It is clear, then, that the *Evangelical* Canon was received in the Second Century.

Again: Tatian, the scholar of Justin Martyr, composed a Gospel History, which he called Diatessaron †, *i. e.* a compendium of the *Four*, which proves that he acknowledged *Four* Evangelists, and Four only.

Again: Polycarp, who according to Irenæus was "instructed by the Apostles, and acquainted with many who had seen Christ," and placed by the Apostles in the Episcopal See of Smyrna, speaks of "the Evangelists ‡" as a definite number of persons; and he specifies them by name, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John.

But, finally, I affirm that the Canon of the Gospels

* S. Iren. III. xi. S. Jerome, in an eloquent passage, ad Paulin. vol. iv. p. 574, calls the Evangelists the "*Quadriga* Domini."

† Euseb. iv. 29. Theodoret, Hæret. i. 20. See also the testimony of Jerome (ad Algas. iv. p. 197), concerning Theophilus Antiochenus, "Quatuor Evangelistarum in unum dicta opus compegit."

‡ Fragm. Polycarpi ap. Feuardent. Iren. iii. 3.

was made by no less a person than Polycarp's Master, the Apostle and Evangelist, St. John. It happened, *non sine numine*,—and providentially the fact has been *recorded*,—that the three earlier Gospels were brought to St. John by the Bishops of Asia for his testimony; whereupon he publicly received and guaranteed them as true *, and wrote his own Gospel, as the *complement* of theirs. Thus he *canonized* the three previous Gospels, and sealed up the Evangelical History: and the concluding words of the last chapter of his Gospel may be regarded as the colophon of the Evangelic Quaternion.

So much for the *Gospels*, which constitute *a most important part*, to say the least, of the New Testament; and yet, without any reference to this evidence, your Divines tell us that the Canon of the New Testament was not settled till the fourth or fifth centuries!

I pass now to the Acts of the Apostles, and to the Epistles of St. Paul. It is related of the Encratite heretics of the time of Irenæus, that they *rejected* the Epistles of St. Paul, and did not even accept the

* Euseb. iii. 24. *τῶν προαναγραφέντων τριῶν εἰς πάντας ἤδη διαδεδομένων, ἀποδέξασθαί φασιν ἀλήθειαν αὐτοῖς ἐπιμαρτυρήσαντα.* See also Clem. Alex. ap. Euseb. vi. 14. The Fragment. Vetust. Canonis ap. Routh Reliquiæ, iv. p. 3—16, mentions the Bishops of Asia. Cave, i. p. 16. "Rogatus ab Asiæ Episcopis sub finem vitæ circa annum CIV. Evangelium conscripsit, partim ut nascentes Cerinthi et Ebionitarum blasphemias refelleret, partim ut ceterorum Evangelistarum defectus suppleret, quod et fecit."

Acts of the Apostles *; hence we infer that they were *received* in the Church. The Acts are declared by St. Luke to be a sequel of his Gospel, and the reception of the one seems almost necessarily to imply the reception of the other: and I would remind you that Irenæus calls the Acts of the Apostles by the name *Evangelium* or *Gospel;* and styles it an "unadulterated rule of faith †." The Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles may be regarded as the Christian Pentateuch.

As the *Gospels* were *canonized* by St. John, so I think it may be said that the *Epistles* of Paul have been stamped in a similar manner by St. Peter. That Apostle, you will remember, in the Second Epistle which bears his name, written, as it would seem ‡, a short time before his death, which took place A.D. 67, the same year as that of St. Paul, speaks of *all* St. Paul's Epistles as *Scripture* §, that is, as *Canonical* Books in the strict sense of the word Canonical, *i. e.* as part of the divinely inspired *Rule* (κανὼν) of Christian Faith and Prac-

* Euseb. iv. 29. βλασφημοῦντες Παῦλον τὸν ἀπόστολον ἀθετοῦσιν αὐτοῦ τὰς Ἐπιστολὰς, μηδὲ τὰς Πράξεις τῶν Ἀποστόλων καταδεχόμενοι.

† Irenæus adv. Hæreses, iii. 15. He speaks of the history of St. Paul's conversion as being part of the *Evangelium* of St. Luke, and calls the whole "regulam veritatis inadulteratam." Tertullian calls the Acts *Scriptura*, and condemns the Marcionites because they reject it. Adv. Marcion. v. 2.

‡ See 2 Pet. chap. i. 14. Compare 2 Pet. chap. iii. 1.

§ 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16. ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς . . . . . τὰς ἄλλας γραφάς.

tice: and in this enumeration he *seems* (though I will not speak confidently on this point) to include the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, for in the last chapter of his Second Epistle, he speaks of Paul having "written unto" those whom he, St. Peter, was addressing *, namely, those of the circumcision: and if so, the Epistle to the *Hebrews* is probably there referred to. There cannot be any doubt, however, that St. Peter sets his seal on all St. Paul's Epistles; and you will remember that all the Epistles which are *now* ascribed to St. Paul, (with the exception of that to the Hebrews,) bear St. Paul's name in the *first verse* of each, and that St. Paul (as he himself tells us) was careful to affix tokens to every one of his Epistles, to distinguish them from supposititious Epistles counterfeited in his name †. We may therefore, I think, conclude that our present Pauline Canon is avouched by the authority of St. Peter.

Again: the old Peschito, or Version of the Syrian Church, in the opinion of some of the most learned critics, dates from the first or second century: and all the books specified above,—namely, the Four

* 2 Pet. iii. 5. "Our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given unto him, hath written unto *you*." Macknight, Preface to St. Peter, Sect. ii., and ad. iii. 15, 16, says,—"It is certain that Peter had seen all Paul's Epistles, and that he knew him to be the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews." See also, the Rev. C. Forster's very learned work "On the Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews."

† 2 Thess. iii. 17. 1 Cor. xvi. 21. Col. iv. 18.

Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Pauline Epistles,—are found in this version. Now, some time must be allowed to have elapsed before a Version could be made *at all;* hence, if *this* Version is as old as is generally supposed, these books must have been received as canonical in the first century.

Here, then, we have advanced another very considerable step, and our astonishment becomes greater than before, that any one should assert that the Canon of the New Testament was not formed till the fourth or fifth centuries, and that a person, who has ventured to affirm this, should be hailed with cordial approval by the Bishops of a Christian Church.

But what, you may ask, is to be said of the remaining books of the New Testament; namely, the two Epistles of St. Peter, the three of St. John, those of St. James and St. Jude, and the Apocalypse * ?

In reply to this question, let me cite the following testimonies :—

"Peter (says Origen †) left one Epistle, received by all, and let us grant the second to be his likewise ‡. What shall we say of John, who reclined on the

* Of these, the Second Epistle of Peter, the Second and Third of John, the Epistle of Jude, and the Revelation, are not found in all the MSS. of the Syriac versions; but in *some* they are. Bp. Walton supposes that the version was made before these books were written. Proleg. in Bibl. Polyglott, xiii. 15; they are now received as canonical by the Churches of Syria. See Guido Fabritius, Præf. in Vers. Lat. Syr. Test.

† Ap. Euseb. vi. 25.

‡ This is clear. See 2 Pet. i. 1. 2 Pet. i. 17, 18, and iii. 1.

bosom of Jesus at supper? He left a Gospel, and the Apocalypse, and one brief Epistle, and also a second and a third, for let us allow these two, though *all* do not account them genuine; but both together do *not amount to more than a hundred lines.* Concerning the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, my opinion is, that the ideas are the work of the Apostle, but the *diction* from some one else, who methodized the sayings of St. Paul. But whatever Church receives this Epistle as St. Paul's, let it be lauded for so doing, for our *forefathers* did not *deliver it* to us as his without good reason."

I would observe, that there is no intimation that Origen doubted of the *Canonicity* of *any* of the abovementioned books, though he would not speak with unqualified confidence on the comparatively insignificant question of their *authorship.* Let me add, that the great Athanasius enumerates all the Seven Catholic or General Epistles, as well as * that to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse, in the Catalogue which he gives of the Books of the New Testament, and speaks of this Catalogue as no *modern* composition, but as the expression of the Primitive Tradition of the Church. His words are remarkable, and I will cite them.

"Since many persons (he says) have ventured to compose writings (which we call Apocryphal), and to insert them among the *Divinely Inspired* books of

* Epist. xxxix. Opera, ii. 38.

Scripture (as of equal * authority with it), which they who were eye-witneses and ministers of the word from the beginning delivered to our Fathers, it seemed good to me, at the instigation of certain holy brethren, and of my own knowledge, to exhibit here a Catalogue of the Books which are canonized among us, and have been handed down to us, and believed by us to be *Divine*. . . . . These are the fountains of salvation from which every one that is thirsty may drink and be satisfied. These *alone* are our School of Christian Faith. To *these* let no one *add:* from these let no one *subtract any thing* †."

Such are the words of the great Athanasius; how irreconcileable with the assertions of the Essayist, and with the practice of Rome!

But you may say, was there then no question at all

* I would observe that St. Athanasius mentions a class of books *standing between* the Canonical and Apocryphal; and this intermediate class consists of what *we* in our English Bible call *Apocrypha*, but which he called *Ecclesiastica*, or *ἀναγιγνωσκόμενα*, i. e. *read* in Churches (though not *Canonical* or inspired), as distinct from *his ἀπόκρυφα*, which were *not* so read. In this intermediate class he enumerates Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Esther, Judith, and Tobit. His words are:—"For the sake of greater accuracy, I add, that besides the *Canonical*, there are other books, not canonized, but published (*τετυπωμένα*) by the Fathers, to be read for further edification in godliness, wisdom, &c. But observe (he adds) whereas the former are canonized, and this second class are read in Churches, there is no tradition in favour of *apocryphal* books; but they are the devices of heretics, writing them when they choose, and pretending that they are ancient."

† Ibid. *ἐν τούτοις μόνοις τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας διδασκαλεῖον εὐαγγελίζεται· μηδεὶς τούτοις ἐπιβαλλέτω.*

in the Church before the end of the fourth century, concerning the canonicity of *any* one book in the New Testament?

In answer to this demand, let me quote the words of Eusebius in his Church History, written about A.D. 330.

"It is reasonable (says he) in this part of my work to enumerate the Scriptures of the New Testament. First of all, we must place the Holy Quaternion of Gospels, followed by the Acts of the Apostles; next the Epistles of Paul, and the First Epistle of John, and the First of Peter, and (if it so seems good) the Apocalypse. These are *universally received.* Of those which are received partially, but recognized by the *majority*, are the Epistles of James and Jude, the Second of Peter, and the Second and Third of John. . . . I have made this Catalogue distinguishing those which are universally received according to the Tradition of the Church, from the others which are received partially, but acknowledged by the majority."

On these words of Eusebius, I would beg leave to offer one observation. The Second Epistle of Peter, the Second and Third of John, and the Epistles of James and Jude, and the Revelation, were received by the *majority* of Christians *. Now permit me to

* The Second Epistle of Peter was received as his by Origen (vii. Homil. in Josuam), and by Firmilian, in his letters to Cyprian, Ep. 85. The Second of John owned as his by Irenæus (i. 13); the

say, *this* reception by the *majority* was itself equivalent to their canonization, in the minds of all judicious, peace-loving, and candid men; so far at least that they would not raise any controversy on the subject. You may recollect the precept of Augustine on this subject *, "In Canonical Scriptures, you must follow the judgment" (not of Rome, —although that Church in her Canon Law † has *corrupted* the passage so as to *mean* Rome—but) "of the majority of Churches: you will prefer those which are received by *all* Catholic Churches, to those which are not received by some; but in those which are not universally received, you will prefer those which the major and graver part receive, to those which are received by fewer Churches and those of minor authority. And if you find some received by the

Third by Origen and Dionysius Alexandrinus, Euseb. vii. 25. The Epistle of James was received as his by Origen (viii. Homil. in Exod.). The Epistle of Jude was acknowledged to be his by Tertullian, De Cultu Fœminarum, i. 3. The Apocalypse is ascribed to St. John the Apostle by Justin Martyr, in his Dialogue with Trypho, p. 308, and c. Marcion. iii. 14 and 23; by Irenæus, iv. 37; by Tertullian; Origen, in S. Matt. tom. xvi.; and is quoted about a hundred times by Cyprian. See Richardson on the Canon, p. 40; and Jones on the Canon, i. p. 37; and note on this subject by Dr. Routh, in his Reliquiæ Sacræ, iv. 25—30, where he has published a very ancient Canon of Scripture.

* De Doctrinâ Christianâ, ii. 8.

† Jus Canon. Decret. i. Dist. xix. c. 6. "Quas *apostolica sedes* habere et ab *eâ* alii meruerunt habere epistolas," as if all Canonical writings were addressed to Rome, and had been received *from her!* S. Augustine's words *really are*, "quæ apostolicas sedes habere et epistolas accipere meruerunt," de Doctr. Christ. ii. 13, ed. Bened.

majority, and others received by the more authoritative Churches,—though I do not think this case will ever occur,—you may regard them as of equal authority."

But now, my dear Sir, do I intend to affirm that there was no room for doubting of the canonicity of *any one* book of the New Testament before the fifth century? No, certainly not: there *was* room for such doubting *then*, and if we *wish* to doubt, there is just as much room for doubting *now;* and, if we please, we may, on the strength of such doubts concerning *one* or *two* books of the New Testament, so magnify and exaggerate the evidence in *favour* of doubting as to affirm, in *general* terms, that the Canon of the New Testament was not settled till the fourth or fifth centuries,—or, which is not a whit more preposterous, that it is not settled at this day.

But what I would request you to bear in mind is this, that the evidence concerning the Canon of the New Testament, is precisely of the same nature and degree as that which God had given us, concerning all the fundamental principles on which our Religion rests. That evidence is *probable;* by which I mean that there is abundance of it to convince our reason, if we are disposed to be convinced, and not enough to exclude our cavils if we are determined to be captious. The evidence is of such a kind as to excite and exercise our faith, if we are willing to believe; but not such as to *compel* us to believe, if we desire to be

sceptical. This, I say, is in exact accordance with the rest of the proof, which God has given us, of the truth of Christianity *. Let me illustrate this proposition by a cognate example to that of the Canon.

The New Testament was dictated by *God*, but it was written by *man*. It was not stereotyped in any angelic printing press; but was committed to parchment by human hands. It has been transcribed into innumerable MSS., and printed in countless editions: and of those MSS. and editions there is not one absolutely immaculate; not one, I say, which exhibits the text in precisely the same words and syllables and letters, as it came from the hands of the Apostles and Evangelists of Christ. Some MSS. omit such or such a portion of a verse; others a whole verse; others an entire chapter. Thus the various readings, as they are called, of the original

* See Bp. Butler's Analogy, Part II. chap. 6:—"That religion is not intuitively true, but a matter of deduction and inference; that a conviction of its truth is not forced upon every one, but left to be by some collected, with needful attention to premises; this constitutes *religious probation*. . . . . The speculative difficulties in which the evidence of religion is involved may make even the principal part of some persons' *trial*." See also Waterland's Works, v. 321, ed. Van Mildert. "There is *no infallible* preservative against heresy, no *irresistible* expedient, any more than against *other vices*: neither ought there to be any; for then a right belief would be no matter of choice, nor faith any longer a virtue, as God designed it to be. But though we cannot expect to *work miracles* by the help of Antiquity and Scripture; for heresies there will be (1 Cor. xi. 19); yet they are both of great use among *reasonable men*: which *is sufficient*."

text of the New Testament, amount to some hundreds of thousands. Why, therefore, does not some second Essayist arise and tell us—but, I forget, Romanists have *already* told us *—that the text of the New Testament is very uncertain; that we want a Pope to help us to an infallible edition of the *New* Testament; as we have already had two Popes, who have presented us with two infallible, though very different, editions of the *Old?*

But no; the Text of the New Testament, with all these Various Readings, is certain enough for all who have judgment and candour; and the number of MSS. from which these Various Readings arise, is the very thing which gives certainty to the Text. There would be fewer Various Readings in the New Testament, if there were fewer MSS. of it; but *then* there would be fewer means of *establishing* a sound text, as well as of *verifying* it when established, for *Manuscripts* are precisely the things which enable us to do this. The *fewer* the MSS. of an ancient author are, the *worse* the text of the author; and the *more* the MSS. are, the *better* the

* See Dr. Milner's End of Controversy, Letter IX. "I will not show you the endless varieties of readings, with respect to words and whole passages, which occur in different copies of the Sacred Text." See also Bentley on Free-thinking, p. 110, ed. 1743. "Father Simon laboured to prove the uncertainty of the text of Scripture . . . a true piece of Popish priestcraft to confound the Reformation, by labouring to prove the Sacred Text precarious; and this avowed enemy to all Priests and Priestcraft (Collins) concurs openly with that Papist in his pious intention."

text. And *because* the MSS. of the New Testament are very numerous, therefore its Text *is* in *a very sound state.* Yes, my dear Sir, *be assured* the Text is quite certain enough to every one who does not *wish* it to be *uncertain;* and it is only uncertain to him who does not desire it to be certain. So it was with the Canon of the New Testament in the first four centuries; it was settled for every one who did not wish it to be unsettled; and it was not settled for any one who did not desire it to be settled. And if any one wishes *now* to *unsettle* it; if any one is so in love with uncertainty as on the strength of some certain slight demur in this or that private person or Church, concerning the canonicity of one or two of the *least books* of the New Testament; if, I say, any one will therefore affirm that the Canon was not fixed till the fourth or fifth century, let him, if he wishes, strain at the gnats of these miserable *dubitatiunculæ,* and then when he has done so, his appropriate punishment will be—to complete the Pharisaical operation, and to gulp down the camel of the Papacy!

But I must now go on to observe, that by contending for the doubtfulness of the Canon of the New Testament, your new convert has upset the very thing he wishes to establish—I mean the Supremacy and Infallibility of the Papal Chair. The Canon, he says, was not settled for four centuries Where then, I ask, was your living unerring Judge? Surely this was a

worthy occasion—a *dignus vindice nodus*—if there ever was one,—for the exercise of *his* authority. To put an end to the doubts of the Church concerning her sacred books; to settle the Canon of Scripture; this would indeed have been a glorious work. O Roman Father, Prince of Apostles, Head of the Church, Bishop of Bishops, Universal Pastor, *this*, believe me, is worth doing; and *thou*, being our Sovereign Pontiff and Infallible Judge, alone canst do it—*Operum hoc, mihi crede, tuorum est!* But no; the first century passes away, and no Canon settled; the second is waning, and nothing is done; the third elapses, and no one yet knows what Scripture is; the fourth is rapidly expiring, and no settlement has taken place: and the New Testament, like a

> "——— Magnus
> Mirandusque cliens *sedet* ad prætoria Regis,
> Donec Romano libeat *vigilare* tyranno;"

He still slumbers and "must needs be awaked *;" though (as the old Poet says) he who has the care of so many people, ay, of all the Churches, ought not to pass the night in slumber—

> οὐ χρὴ παννύχιον εὕδειν βουληφόρον ἄνδρα—

---

* Newman's Essay, p. 165. "In course of time, first the power of the Bishop *awoke*, and then the power of the Pope," p. 145. "Nor would a Pope arise, but in proportion as the Church was consolidated," p. 166. "The *regalia Petri* might *sleep*, not as an obsolete, for it *never* had been *operative*, but as a mysterious privilege, which was not understood; as an unfulfilled prophecy." See also above, p. 39.

and after all, in the fifth century, the Canon is settled—*without him!*

O thou second Daniel, most admirable "*living* Infallible Judge!" What hast thou been doing all the while that this question has remained undecided for so many years, and after all is not decided by thee? O how useful and necessary a thing is the Papacy! Well, indeed, might Bellarmine say that Divine Providence "would not have taken care to secure the welfare of the Church, if He had not instituted it!"

What, my dear friend, will be your reply to all this? Will you say with the Essayist that the Pope could not *act* before he was *born*, and that he was only in an embryo state—*in ovo*—during the first four or five centuries, but that when he broke his shell, and was full fledged (it was rather late to be sure), he showed his power most royally in the business of settling the Canon? Yes, we remember that well. Pope Gregory VII., in the eleventh century, said very boldly, "Not a single book or chapter of Scripture shall be held Canonical without my authority *." Alas! for the world before his authority *awoke!* It had no Bible. Another Pope, Sixtus V., in 1590, authorized a Latin Bible as an authentic Infallible Standard, in the place of the Hebrew and Greek Original! and in this Latin Bible several books are

* Dictatus Papæ ap. Card. Baron. ad A.D. 1076, tom. xi. 653, ed. Colon. 1609. "Nullum Capitulum nullusque liber Canonicus habeatur, *absque Papæ auctoritate.*"

called Canonical, which were never regarded as such by the Christian Church for fifteen hundred years! and in 1592 behold another development! Clement VIII. comes forth with another Latin Bible, to supersede the Infallible Bible of his Predecessor, and differing from it in several thousand places *! This was acting like a Pope indeed: and *if* Scripture *ought* to be thus treated, we must indeed allow the Pope to be necessary to the Church; for it never has been so treated, and never will or can be by any one in the world but a Pope †!

But, my dear Sir, let me here remind you, that if your plea be allowed in favour of the supreme claims of the Papacy, although it remained undeveloped for some six hundred years, you have been very hard upon *us*. We appeal to the *ancient* Church. We take our stand upon the old paths. Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω,—"Let the ancient customs prevail," we say with the great Council of Nice, which your Bossuet ‡ tells us was infallible. Nothing

* See Dr. James, Bellum Papale, pp. xii. xxv. xxviii. ed. Cox, and Corruption of the Fathers, p. 111, ed. Lond. 1688.

† Pighius, Hierarch. lib. iii. cap. 3, ap. Chemnitz. Conc. Trident. p. 32, says: "Ecclesia (i. e. Romana) habet illam potestatem ut possit Scripturis quibusdam *impertiri canonicam* auctoritatem." Stapleton, lib. ix. Doct. Princ. c. 14, et Relect. Princ. Doct. p. 514, says: "*Præsentem* Ecclesiam posse librum in Canonem recipere." Perrone, ii. p. 1051: "Ecclesia Romana *suum* potuit *constituere Canonem*."

‡ See his letter to Robert Nelson, Life of Bp. Bull, p. 330, "De l'assistance infaillible du Saint-Esprit dans le Concile de Nicée."

is professed by *us* as an article of *Faith* which we cannot prove to have been preached by Christ and His Apostles, and received from them by the Primitive Church. And yet, after all, we poor Anglicans are to be denounced by you as rash *innovators*—we are religious revolutionists, schismatical Jacobins, forgers of novelties, utterers of base coin, and what not!—and then we are to be inundated with tracts from the Catholic Institute, to prove to us, who know nothing forsooth of Primitive Christianity, that Popery is the "Old Religion!" and that we have fallen away from "the Church of our Fathers!"

In the mean time, you will permit me to ask, in the words of the great and venerable St. Jerome, "Why, after four hundred years, do you pretend to teach the Church what she *never knew before?* Why do *you* promulgate a doctrine which Peter and Paul never preached? Up to this day the world was without *that* doctrine of yours. I am resolved to retain that faith, as an old man, in which I was brought up as a boy*." This, I say, would have been St. Jerome's answer to your attempts to compel him to receive your cardinal doctrine of the Papal Supremacy, which your new convert allows was not developed for many hundred years after the birth of Christ. And this is *our* reply also.

I have dwelt longer on this question of the Canon of Scripture, not only on account of its importance,

* Ad Theophilum, Epist. XII. tom. ii. p. 486, ed. 1643.

but because the Essayist's assertion, with respect to it, is a fair specimen of the process by which he has been brought to an acknowledgment of the claims of the Church of Rome. Not for its antiquity—no, this is renounced; not for its Catholicity—no, for this falls with that renunciation; not because it is recommended by the dictates of Reason or of Scripture, for Reason is weak and "Scripture disappoints" —is the Papacy embraced by him; but it is eagerly grasped at as a straw floating on the surface of the sea of doubt, raised by himself, in which he is sinking. But he has proved that it *is* only a straw, by pulling it with him under the water. He has shown that it cannot sustain him or any one else. He has proved that, if you have many more such conversions, your cause is lost; a few more such victories will ruin you. You had much better suspend your prayers for "our return to Unity,"

> "Evertere domos totas *optantibus* ipsis
> Di faciles."

Who knows whether his apology for Romanism may not prove more injurious to it than the assaults of Luther against it?

But to return for one moment to the question on the Canon, and I will close this Letter.

In His providential dispensations towards us, both in the world of Nature and of Grace, Almighty God does not exercise *compulsion*. He draws us with the "cords of a man." He gives us Moses and the

Prophets, Christ and the Apostles, and bids us "hear them;" but He does not *force* us so to do. He does not take us by storm. He speaks to us in *parables*, and thus *tries* us, whether we will be of those, who "seeing see not; or of those whose eyes are blessed, for they see; and their ears, for they hear*." He allows us, if we will, to doubt and to cavil; and if we are disposed to do so, He *punishes* us by making our mole-hills of doubts appear to us to be mountains. He exercises our faith by apparent difficulties; and then, if we come to Him with a loving and teachable heart, He rewards us by removing them. We have seen specimens of this mode of His dealing with us, both in the Canon and in the Text of the New Testament; and what has been said of them may be applied to all the other objects which are proposed to our Faith.

But now permit me to observe, that by introducing a Pope—a living, infallible Judge—into the scheme of Christianity, you mar the whole. You alter its whole constitution as framed by Christ. You annihilate its *probationary* and *disciplinarian* character. You destroy our moral nature. You materialize our minds. You reduce us from men to machines. You annihilate our Faith by force. You resolve Reason and Conscience, and Scripture, into

* Matt. xiii. 13—16.—Matt. iv. 34. "Without a parable spake He not unto them; and when they were alone, He expounded (ἐπέλυε) all things to His disciples."

the will of an infallible guide, as you call him. But then, my dear Sir, if we now read and reflect, we find (indeed you do not deny the fact) that this our infallible guide was unknown to the Church for many centuries; that it is no necessary part of Christianity, that it is only an *accident!* What then? By this your attempt to give us *superhuman* certainty, you have deprived us of *all* certainty. The Athenian statue was so contrived that it fell to pieces when the name of Phidias was removed; so the fabric of Romanism is shivered to atoms, when the name of an unerring authority is torn away. The rock crumbles into a quicksand; and the beacon of Infallibility becomes an ignis fatuus of Infidelity *.

We retrace our steps with fear; and take refuge in the Word of God.

I am, Sir,
With great regard,
Yours truly,
&c. &c.

* Life of Blanco White, i. 256. "Into the authority of the Roman Church I resolved the certainty of my faith as a Christian; yet I did no sooner allow myself to *examine* the *question* of Church Infallibility, than my whole Christianity *vanished like a dream!*"

LETTER IV.

'Εστὶ τοίνυν τῆς μὲν παλαιᾶς διαθήκης βιβλία τῷ ἀριθμῷ τὰ πάντα εἴκοσι δύο,—ταῦτα πηγαὶ τοῦ σωτηρίου, ἐν τούτοις μονοις τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας διδασκαλεῖον εὐαγγελίζεται· Μηδεὶς τούτοις ἐπιβαλλέτω.—S. Athanas. Epist. xxxix.

My dear Sir,

If it could have been shown that the Church of the first four centuries did not know what the Scriptures of the *New* Testament are, we might perhaps be led to believe that she did not learn what those of the *Old* Testament are, till she was informed by the Council of Trent in the sixteenth century. The former of these two allegations has been considered in the preceding letter; and I now proceed to observe, that the Church of Rome, by making a new Canon of the *Old* Testament at that Council, has presented to the world a *practical* example of the Doctrine of Development in all its *destructiveness* of what is most sacred and valuable to mankind.

On the eighth day of April, A. D. 1546, little more than three hundred years ago, certain Roman Divines and Canonists met at the Cathedral of the

City of Tridentum, or Trent, in the Tyrol. After hearing Mass they proceeded to the important business for which they were assembled, which was no other than to determine, of what books Holy Scripture consists, and on what principles these books are to be interpreted.

You, my dear Sir, and other Romanists are wont to speak in the most reverential terms of what you call —and what called itself*—the "*Sacrosancta Synodus Œcumenica Tridentina in Sancto Spiritu legitimè congregata.*" I remember hearing one of your most learned Divines speak of it as inspired by the Holy Ghost; indeed this is your usual language concerning it. But permit me to ask,—which I do with great deference to your feelings on so serious a subject,—did you ever take the pains seriously to examine what this Council was, of what materials it was composed, and under what influence it acted?

I will say nothing of the authority by which it was convened, but will merely remind you that no General Council of the Church was ever summoned for the first thousand years after Christ by the same power as summoned the Council of Trent—I mean the Bishop of Rome;—so† that it had a radical defect in its Convocation which vitiated all its proceedings; but I will request you to suppose yourself at Trent at the opening of the Session of 1546. You

* Sessio IV.

† See Bp. Beveridge on our XXIst Article.

imagine yourself, perhaps, like the Gallic soldier when he entered the Roman senate-house—awe-struck by the venerable aspect of the assembly. In idea, it may be, you have a vision of mitred Patriarchs and Prelates, with snow-white beards, from every quarter of the world. You expect, perhaps, another Council of Nicæa with 318 Bishops,—if not, a Synod of Chalcedon with 630 ; or of Basle or Constance with about 1000. A *Sacrosancta Synodus Œcumenica in Sancto Spiritu congregata* (listen to these high-sounding titles) summoned to a most convenient spot for East and West, North and South, after a preparation of more than twenty years, must needs be something wonderfully august and numerously attended. And then the *subject* for deliberation, how solemn is it, sufficient of itself, you would think, to stir the hearts of all Christendom—like the voice of Peter the hermit—to make a pilgrimage to Trent. But what was the *fact?* In this Session of the Sacred Œcumenical Synod there were not above *fifty-three**

* See the names in Streitwolf, Libri Symbolici Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, ii. p. 21. It is said by Romanist writers, that though it cannot be denied that the Council of Trent, in its *fourth session*, in 1546, at which the Roman Canon of Scripture was framed, consisted only of *fifty-three Bishops*, and they *such* Bishops as I have described, yet that all the decrees of Trent were subsequently confirmed at the *close* of the Council in 1563 ; and that the number of prelates and others who subscribed their names to this *final* sanction was *two hundred and fifty-five ;* and that the Roman Canon of Scripture ought to be considered as the work of *all* the Bishops who sanctioned the decrees, of which that concerning the Canon was one. Be it so ; we have therefore here another proof of the unhappy *bondage* in which

Bishops! and, if each represented his own flock, they represented no more than the thousandth part of Christendom; and of these fifty-three some were * mere titular Bishops, without Sees, Bishops made for the occasion by the Pope; many of them living on his alms †, and more than four-fifths of them Italians, and all of them bound by an oath of obedience to the Pope, and none of them able to open their lips except on topics propounded by his legates ‡, who presided in the convention, and had orders from him to put nothing to the vote which had not been approved at Rome.

And this, my dear Sir, is to be called a General Synod of all Christendom! why, one of our Trent-valley Railway Committees might as well call itself

Roman Bishops are. First; it is certain that all these two hundred and fifty-three prelates were *sworn* vassals of the Pope; next, that they were *compelled* to subscribe *all* the decrees of Trent "*sotto scomunica*" (as not only Sarpi, p. 758, but Pallavicini also, lib. xxiv. c. 8, informs us); next, the Council having asserted itself to be inspired, and having made a decree concerning the Canon of Scripture, they could not recede from this decree, or their infallibility was at an end. The assertion of *inerrancy* had bound them in a perpetual *necessity of erring*; and now we only add, that *if* they *really* love the *truth*, if they love their *own Church*, the Romanist clergy and laity of the present day will take comfort to themselves from the consideration, that the error of the *fourth* session was the error only of a few; and, instead of identifying themselves with it, they will be the very *first* to affirm that the Council of Trent was *no general* Council, and that they are not bound by its decrees.

* See Sarpi, Istoria di Concilio, ad annum 1546, pp. 117. 127. 131. 153. 433. 783, 784. 823, of Brent's Translation. Lond. 1676.

† Sleidan Comment. 17. Bp. Cosin on the Canon, p. 211—216.

‡ Sarpi, p. 130. 137. 154.

the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland, as the Trent Cabal (excuse the name) style itself a Council of the Church.

And yet we are called upon to receive its decrees as divine oracles, and are to be anathematized as heretics if we do not! Stigmatize us, however, as you will, we must use our Reason, (for we are accountable to a higher tribunal than Trent for that,) and you must pardon me for saying that the Tridentine Synod was a mere Puppet, an Italian Marionette pulled by wires in the hands of the Pope; and since this Tridentine Automaton, having learnt its lesson from him, would needs dictate it to the world, it must even permit me to say to it in the name of Reason and of Truth,—

> "Tu, mihi qui *imperitas*, aliis *servis* miser, atque
> Duceris, ut *nervis alienis mobile lignum*."
>
> HOR. SAT. II. vii. 81.

And alas! this is not all. This Tridentine neurospastic Machine is taught not only to utter new decrees, but to vent imprecations on all who will not receive them; and,—in the matter now before us,—on all who cannot receive as God's Word in the Old Testament those Books which the Church of the Jews, to whom, as we know from the New Testament, the "lively oracles of God were committed*," *never*† received as such; that is, which Christ and

* Rom. iii. 2. Acts vii. 38. xiii. 14. 27. xv. 21.

† See Josephus, lib. i. 8. contra Apionem; Euseb. H. E. iii. 9 and

His Apostles *never* so received. Our Blessed Lord comprehended the Old Testament under the title of "The Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms*," (where the *Psalms* comprehended all the Hagiographa or Chethubim, and, being the first and most eminent, gave a name to the rest,) and in quoting from these, He is expressly said to have expounded "in *all* the *Scriptures* the things concerning Himself†." Neither He nor His Apostles (as far as we know) ever confirmed any article of Faith, by any citation from any *other* books than those which were received as Canonical by the Church of the Jews; and which have been delivered by them into the hands of the Christian Church‡. But the Church

10; and Melito ap. Euseb. H. E. iv. 26; and Philo ap. Euseb. de Præp. Evang. viii. Hence Cardinal Bellarmin, De Verbo Dei, says truly, "Omnes Libros quos Protestantes non recipiunt, etiam Hebraici non admittunt." It may be observed, that this fact renders the Church of England a much fitter instrument than the Church of Rome for the conversion of the Jews. How can it be expected that they will ever receive *nine* books, in addition to the Canon of their Fathers, who, as Philo says (l. c.), "would rather die a thousand deaths than suffer a single letter of their sacred books to be altered?" Besides this, if nine books, which the Jews do not receive, are to become part of our Rule of Faith, then Christianity is deprived of the argument, so powerfully urged by the early Fathers in her behalf, that she proves her cause against Jews and Pagans from documents which she has received from her *adversaries*—the Jews.

* Luke xxiv. 27.

† Luke xxiv. 44.

‡ Hence Melito, Bishop of Sardis, in the second century, went to *Palestine* to satisfy himself, by personal inquiry, what the Books of the Old Testament were. ἀνελθὼν εἰς ἀνατολὴν, καὶ ἕως τοῦ τόπου γενόμενος ἔνθα ἐκηρύχθη καὶ ἐπράχθη, καὶ ἀκριβῶς μαθὼν τὰ τῆς

of Rome at the Council of Trent placed *other* books on an *equal* footing with those thus delivered to the Church of the Jews by God, and which alone were treated as divine by Christ and His Apostles*; and the Church of Rome anathematized, and still anathematizes†, all who do not and cannot receive these *other* books, as of equal authority with those whose inspiration is guarantied by Christ. What is this but with profane irreverence to dictate to the Supreme Being Himself? Must we not say to you, "Apud vos de *humano* arbitratu Deus pensitatur; nisi *homini* Deus placuerit, Deus non erit‡?" What is it but to elevate human authors into divine, and, after the manner of ancient Rome, as S. Chrysostom§

παλαιᾶς διαθήκης βιβλία ὑποτάξας ἐπεμψά σοι. Euseb. iv. 26. His catalogue includes *none* of the Apocryphal or Ecclesiastical books. See also Routh, Rel. Sacræ, i. 113—128.

* The Romanist writer, Stapleton, confesses this, De Autorit. S. S. ii. 4. 14. "Sapientiam, Ecclesiasticum, Tobiam, Judith, et alios V. T. libros *Apostolorum* temporibus non fuisse confirmatos." And not only so, but it is allowed by Romish divines, that books now received by them as *inspired*, and imposed as such under anathema on the whole world, were not received as *inspired* in the fourth century: they do not mention the time when they *became* inspired. Thus Sixtus Senensis VIII. Hæres. 9: "Respondemus de verbis Hieronymi asserentis librum Sapientiæ in Canone ab Ecclesiâ non recipi, eum de Ecclesiâ *suorum temporum* id intellexisse." So Melchior Canus, ii. Locor. c. ii.: "Id eo tempore factum quo res *nondum* erat definita." And Cardinal Bellarmine: "Admitto Hieronymum in eâ fuisse opinione, quia nondum generale Concilium de his libris aliquid statuerat." The Canon had not been *developed*.

† "Si quis libros ipsos integros pro sacris et canonicis non receperit—anathema sit!" Conc. Trid. Sess. iv.

‡ Tertullian, Apol. § 5.

§ In 2 Cor. Hom. 26.

says, χειροτονεῖν θεοὺς—to create gods by a show of hands?

You will perhaps say, in reply to these observations, that a Council* in the fourth century, namely, the Council of Carthage, A.D. 397† received certain of the *other* books‡ above mentioned as Canonical; and that the Council of Trent only repeated what had been done at Carthage before.

The answer to this objection is easy. Let it be allowed for argument's sake that this Council *did* receive these *other* books as Canonical, that is, in the strict sense of the word, as *inspired*,—as the Word of God,—as a part of the *Rule of Faith*.

Then, we say, this Council was a mere *local* one. It appears to have consisted of only forty-six or forty-seven Bishops, and it was of no general authority; it *erred* in this point, as it did err most manifestly in calling Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus books of *Solo-*

* III. Concil. Carthag. Can. XLVII.

† This is the date assigned to this Council in its title, which states that it was held in the Consulship of Cæsarius and Atticus, which falls in that year; but this 47th Canon speaks of Boniface being then Bishop of Rome, who did not occupy that See till the year A.D. 418: so that the genuineness of the Canon is liable to suspicion.

‡ Tobit, Judith, Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, Second Book of Esdras, two Books of Maccabees. The Council of Trent, by adopting the *Vulgate* as authentic, receives also by implication the Apocryphal part of Esther, the Song of the Three Children, the Story of Susanna, and that of Bel and the Dragon. See Bp. Marsh's Comparative View, p. 80. These last three are regarded by the Church of Rome as parts of the Book of Daniel. See ibid. p. 83, the citation from Cardinal Bellarmine, saying, "Certum est has omnes partes Danielis verè esse canonicas."

*mon**, when it is most certain that neither of them was written till many hundred years after Solomon's age, and that one of them was never extant in Hebrew at all.

Let me remind you also, that one of the greatest of your Popes, Gregory the First, has pronounced that the Council of Carthage *erred*, *if* such was its meaning; for† *he* distinctly affirms that the books of the Maccabees are *not* Canonical.

Besides, this Council, if such was its meaning, is directly opposed to the decree of the Council of Laodicea, held about the year 360, which, in reciting the Canonical Books of the Old Testament, *omits* all those which were not received as inspired by the *Jewish* Church and by Christ and His Apostles: and the decree of Laodicea was received into the Code of the Universal Church‡, and confirmed by the Fourth General Council§, that of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) consisting of 630 Bishops. What, therefore, is the authority of Forty-seven Bishops at Carthage, that it should be set against the judgment of the *whole Church?*

But further, the Council of Carthage does not *impose* its Canon of Scripture on any *other* Church. On the contrary, it orders that it should be sent to

* It speaks in this Canon of "Salomonis libri *quinque!*"

† Gregor. Moral. Exposit. in Job xix. cap. 17. He calls them "Libros *non* canonicos," and excuses himself for quoting them.

‡ Canon. Univers. Ecclesiæ, CLXIII.

§ Canon I.

other Churches to be compared with theirs ; so that it shows itself ready to be set right if it should be in error. If therefore it erred, it erred involuntarily, and desired correction. But the conduct of the Church of Rome, at Trent, was very different from this. It made a new Canon, differing from that of the Church of the Jews, and of the Christian Church for fifteen hundred years, and from *its own Canon up to that time ;* and it uttered *imprecations* on all who would not receive this new Canon, which, with all its pretensions to infallibility, it had not propounded till the year 1546.

And, last of all, for my own part, I do not charge the Bishops of Carthage with any error at all. I believe that they use the word *Canonical* in a *wider* sense than the word *inspired* admits ; and that by calling these *other* books Canonical, they intended only to say, that they were enrolled* in the list of books which might be *read* in the Church, as some of them *are* read in the Church of England†, "for example of life, and instruction of manners," but not "to *establish any doctrine.*"

Non meus hic sermo—this is not *my* opinion only,

* Bingham, XIV. iii. 6. "In some Churches these books (i. e. the Ecclesiastical) were read under the general name of Canonical Scripture, taking that word in a large sense, for such books as were in the rule, or Canon, or *catalogue* of books authorized to be read in the Church. Thus, at least, we must understand the decree of the third Council of *Carthage.*"

† Art. VI.

but it was good Roman doctrine, before the Council of Trent had *developed* the Canon of Scripture into its new form: it is precisely what was stated by your Roman Cardinal, Caietanus, in a letter* to a Pope, Clement VII., and in the Commentaries dedicated to him, where he says that he has written no Expositions on *these* books, because they "are *not*, properly speaking, *Canonical*, that is, cannot be regarded as any part of the *Rule* of *Faith*†; though in a certain sense they may be called, and have been called, Canonical, as profitable to *regulate* the *manners* of the people‡; and with this distinction," he adds, "we must understand the language of some of the ancient Fathers and of the Council of Carthage, to reconcile them with St. Jerome§ and the Council of Laodicea."

These words were written only ten years before the Council of Trent; and contrasted with the anathematizing decree of that Council, they stand

* Epist. Dedicat. ante Comment. Hist. Libr. V. T. et in cap. ult. libri Esther.

† "Non sunt hi Libri Canonici, hoc est, non sunt *regulares* ad firmandum quæ sunt *Fidei*."

‡ "Regulares, ad ædificationem fidelium."

§ S. Jerome, in his Prolog. ad Libr. Salomonis, says that the Church *reads* Tobit, Judith, and Maccabees, but *not* as Canonical books. And again, in Prolog. Galeat. in Libr. Regum: "Wisdom (says he) and Ecclesiasticus are not in the Canon." What makes these prologues, or prefaces, of St. Jerome of more value in this question concerning the Canon of the Old Testament, is, that they were prefixed by *the Church of Rome* to *her own Bibles* up to the time of the Council of Trent.

on record as a remarkable proof of the fact that the Church of Rome does indeed speak great words against the Most High, and "think to *change* times and laws*," even with respect to the eternal Word of the unchangeable God.

I am, dear Sir,
Yours faithfully,
&c. &c.

* Daniel vii. 25.

LETTER V.

"Regula Fidei una omnino est sola immobilis et irreformabilis. Veritas sempiterna et antiqua res."

TERTULLIAN de Virg. Vel. 1.

MY DEAR SIR,

In my last letter it was shown that the Church of Rome has given a practical example of the Doctrine of Development, by making a *new* Bible, and by imposing this *new* Bible—upon the authority of a junta of about thirty-five * Bishops in the sixteenth century—on the consciences of all who would communicate with her, and by anathematizing all who do not receive what was never received by the Apostles of Christ.

But this is not all. She was not content with developing the Bible into a new *substance*, she must also develope it into a new *language*. She would not have the Old Testament read in *Hebrew;* and with good

* I here say thirty-five; for it appears that the Council was *divided* on that very point, and that about fifteen Bishops were *against* the anathema. Sarpi, lib. ii. Pallavicini, VI. c. xi.

reason, for many of the books which she canonized, were not to be found in Hebrew; nor the New Testament in Greek; but in a *Latin* version of her own, which she constituted the "authentic standard, to be followed in all public lectures, sermons, and Expositions *;" so that if doctrine can be established by means of this version, no appeal is allowed to the original Hebrew in the Old Testament, or to the Greek in the New. In a word, the Church of Rome claims for herself the power of placing the human translation above the Divine original.

But observe, so negligent was the Church of Rome of this her own authentic standard, that only forty-five years after the Council of Trent, one of her Popes complained that the genuine text of it had never been accurately fixed†. This, then, Sixtus the Fifth intended to do. He published a Latin Bible in 1590; and decreed that it should be received as the authentic edition of the Old and New Testament, and that all other texts should be corrected by ‡ it;

* Sessio IV. Decr. ii. The Sacrosancta Synodus declares that the Latin Vulgate, "in publicis lectionibus, disputationibus, prædicationibus, et expositionibus pro *authenticâ* habeatur, et ut nemo illam rejicere quovis prætextu audeat vel præsumat."

† Sixtus V., in his Preface to his Bible. "Quia nihil profuisset hujus editionis auctoritatem gravissimo sanxisse decreto, si illius quæ germana esset lectio nesciretur—id nos indignè ferentes eoque indignius quod . . . nullum huic imminenti malo remedium adtributum fuerat; nihil antiquius habuimus quam ut Vulgatæ emendationem aggrederemur."

‡ Ibid. "Pro vera, legitima, authentica, et indubitata,—si Biblia juxta nostrum exemplar emendata non fuerint, ea in iis quæ huic

and that any one who should publish or sell a Bible not so corrected, should be excommunicated. Such was the language of Sixtus V. in 1590. But the law of Development is *progress:* and therefore the Church of Rome, true to her unchangeable principle of change, soon treated the Bible of Sixtus with as little reverence as he had done that of his predecessor. Pope Clement VIII. published a new Latin Bible in 1592, differing from that of Sixtus V. in many thousand places, and commanded that no one should print or sell any Bible which did not correspond with *his* authentic edition, on pain of excommunication *.

In what a labyrinth of error are you lost by putting yourself under the conduct of a living infallible Judge, and his inspired Council! First, you have a new Bible, not that of the Fathers of Christendom; next, the Prophets of the Old Testament, and the Apostles of the New, are believed by you to speak their own sense more clearly in a *Latin Version*, than in their own tongue; and next, two Popes, with equal claim to infallibility, shall each canonize a different copy of this Version with many thousand variations; and because *we* cannot digest these

editioni non convenerint, *nullam fidem, nullam auctoritatem habitura esse decernimus.*"

* See Clementis Papæ Præfatio: "Si quis imprimere, vendere, &c. libros a correcto textu in aliquo discrepantes præsumpserit, majoris excommunicationis sententiam eo ipso incurret, a quâ nisi in mortis articulo ab alio quàm a Rom. Pontifice absolvi non possit."

paradoxes, *we* are to be excommunicated as heretics; and while we cling to Antiquity, we are to be denounced as Innovators by those who have deserted ancient Christendom, and renounced their former selves.

Nor is this all: Rome not only requires us to receive a *new*, but an *additional* Bible,—I mean *Tradition*.

A learned English Theologian of the present day, Mr Palmer *, says, that "the Council of Trent decreed in its Fourth Session, that the Christian Truth and Discipline are contained in written Books and unwritten Tradition; but they did not dare to frame their decree in accordance with the *modern* Romish view, that the Christian Verity is contained *partly* in written books, and *partly* in unwritten Tradition."

Such is Mr. Palmer's opinion; but this charitable supposition concerning the Council of Trent is indignantly rejected by Romish Divines; and if we remember that the Tridentine Decree was expressly directed against the true Catholic assertion maintained by the Reformers †, that "the necessary doctrine of the Christian Faith is contained *whole* and *entire* in *Holy Scripture*, and that it is a human fiction to join to it unwritten Traditions," as part of the

* Palmer on the Church, ii. 15.

† "Che la dottrina necessaria della Fede Christiana si contiene tutta intiera nelle divine Scritture, e che è una fintione d'huomini aggiungervi traditioni non scritte." Sarpi, ad ann. 1546.

Rule of *Faith*, we must allow that the Romish Divines are right in their *interpretation* of the decree. But let us hear what they say concerning it.

The present Theological Professor in the Jesuit College at Rome * declares, that "it is sufficient to read the History of the Council of Trent by Cardinal Pallavicini, to be satisfied of the opinion of the Fathers of that Council concerning Tradition;" and accordingly the Professor cites two passages from the Cardinal's work; one as follows: "In their decree, Traditions are joined with Scriptures, because the *former* as well as the *latter* are *Foundations* of the Faith" (*per esser l'une come l'altre fondamenti della Fede*†): and again ‡: "The Council intended to do *two* things in that Decree; first, to assert that the Scriptures are *not* the *Foundations* of the Catholic Faith (che i fondamenti della Fede Cattolica non pur erano le *Scritture*), as the new heretical apostates perfidiously affirm, but *Traditions* also no less than *Scripture*." And Father Perrone, having cited these words, exclaims triumphantly, "Eat nunc Palmer, et nos doceat quid intenderit Tridentinum in suo decreto!"

Gladly would we have seen our estimable countryman's hypothesis cordially welcomed by you; but it appears that we shall incur the displeasure of your

* Perrone, Prælect. Theologicæ, vol. ii. 1217. See also Dens, (Dublin edition,) ii. 109.

† VI. cap. 14, n. 2.

‡ VI. cap. 18, n. 7.

Roman Doctors, if we do not allow you, and your Tridentine Council, to have *two independent* Bibles, (if I may so call them,) the one *written*, the other *unwritten;* one Scripture, the other Tradition; and the latter sufficient of itself to establish articles of Faith. In the words of the Roman Author just quoted *, "The Tridentine Fathers knew well that there are certain Articles of *Faith*, which rest on *Tradition alone;* they sanctioned *Tradition* as a Rule and Foundation of Faith *wholly distinct* from *Scripture.*"

The Essayist also pronounces that Mr. Palmer's hypothesis "is untenable†;" and yet, only two pages afterward, he himself says, somewhat inconsistently, "He" (the Essayist) "is not aware that Post-tridentine Writers *deny* that the *whole* Catholic faith may be proved from *Scripture* ‡!" To be sure, the proof need not be direct, or by logical deduction, for they who acknowledge a living infallible Judge cannot be permitted to exercise their own Reason,—and he, it is allowed, may apply the *figurative* mode of interpretation to Scripture in a very arbitrary manner, as we shall hereafter see §,—and therefore the Essayist adds, "they would certainly maintain that it is not to be found on the *surface* of

* Perrone, ii. p. 1217. "Non ignorabant Patres Tridentini nonnullos articulos Fidei Catholicæ haberi qui soli innituntur Traditioni; sanciverunt Traditiones uti regulam ac fundamentum fidei a *Scripturis planè distinctum.*" See also Möhler, ii. p. 55.

† P. 321. ‡ P. 323. § Letter vi.

Scripture, nor in such sense that it may be gained from Scripture without the aid of Tradition," by which it is evident, from other portions of his work, he means not the *primitive* Tradition of the *Universal Church*, but the *ever-growing inventions* of the *Romish branch* of it.

It is remarkable that the Essayist should have shown so little acquaintance with the works of the Post-tridentine Divines as to assert that they would not "deny that the *whole* Catholic faith may be proved from *Scripture*." As I have already shown, by reference to Perrone and Pallavicini, they *do deny* it. I will only cite two more authorities on this subject, both high ones—Melchior Canus and Stapleton. The former says, "There are many things belonging to the *faith* of Christians which are neither manifestly nor obscurely contained in the sacred Scriptures *;" and Stapleton † affirms that "the Church may propound and define matters of faith without any evident, nay, without any probable testimony of Scripture."

Now, Sir, let me entreat you to reflect, whether the Church of Rome, by assigning equal and independent Authority to Tradition, of which she herself is the only channel, or rather the only *source*, has not only developed a *second, unwritten* Bible, but

* Loc. Theolog. iii. c. 3. fund. 3. See also below, p. 144, &c.

† Relect. contr. 4. q. 1. art. 3, ad art. 12. See also Petavius, Dogm. Theol. ii. p. 175 ; and Dens, i. p. 4, and ii. p. 109.

has *destroyed* the first *written* one? whether what Tertullian says of the heretics of his day is not true of her, "credis *sine* Scripturis, ut credas *contra* Scripturas?" and whether in this way also she does not abrogate the Laws of God, and enact her own in their place?

The ancient Romans kept certain Sibylline Books in a stone coffer underground, beneath the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus; and on sundry occasions the Senate, when they wished a legislative measure to be carried, instructed the officers, who had the inspection of these subterranean Volumes, to make them speak in favourable terms of the proposition which it wished should become law; and the books, as history tells, were generally very obsequious to the Senate's wish. In like manner, the authority who now rules at Rome can enact any thing he chooses by means of the traditions, which, as your Theologians express it *, he keeps "in *scrinio* pectoris sui," in the Sibylline chest of his own bosom; for he alone has access to them, and there is no other copy of them in the world.

You will now perhaps enquire what *our* opinions are concerning the Rule of Faith. I will, therefore, endeavour to explain them. We believe that ignorance of Scripture is the cause of error. "Ye do err,

* 9. Qu. 3. Neque ab Aug. dist. 19. Si Romanorum, in gloss dist. 40. Si Papa, in glossâ.

not knowing the Scriptures *," said our Lord. "The Scriptures cannot be broken." "The Word of the Lord endureth for ever †." True ingenuousness of soul (εὐγένεια) shows itself in searching the Scriptures daily, as the Berrhœans ‡ did; and "*faith* cometh by hearing, and hearing by the *word of God* §."

We of the Church of England know only of *one* Bible: "we have no word of God but *Scripture* ‖," and *that* consists of those books which were *received* by the Apostles and Evangelists as Holy Scripture, or were *written* by them. This is our *only source* of Christian Doctrine ¶. Receiving it as a Rule of Faith at all, we find that we *cannot* receive any *other* co-ordinate Rule, for it *excludes all* other; so that by receiving Tradition as a *joint* Rule, we should, in fact, *reject Scripture*. This, we think, is abundantly clear from *Scripture itself*. St. Peter orders, that "if any man speak, let him speak as the *oracles of God* **," that is, as the Holy Scriptures speak. St. Paul teaches us that Holy Scripture †† (that is, whatever the Holy Spirit had *then* dictated, or was dictating, or might thereafter dictate in *writing*, ἱερὰ γράμματα) is able to make men wise unto salvation; that is, to instruct them in all supernatural, saving

* Matt. xxii. 29.
‡ Acts xvii. 11.
‖ Hooker, V. xxi.
** 1 Pet. iv. 11.
† John x. 35; 1 Pet. i. 35.
§ Rom. x. 17.
¶ Art. VI. and XX.
†† 2 Tim. iii. 15.

truth, through Faith in Christ: and that all divinely-inspired Scripture (γραφὴ θεόπνευστος) is effectual to make the man of God—that is, every sober-minded and teachable person—*perfect*, and *throughly equipped* or *furnished* (ἐξηρτισμένον) to all good works. Again, he tells the Corinthians to learn of him "not to be wise beyond (ὑπὲρ) what is *written* *," and St. James † exhorts us to "receive with meekness the engrafted Word *which is able to save* (τὸν δυνάμενον σῶσαι) our souls."

Since, then, Scripture thus asserts its own *perfection* as a Rule of Faith, it is an insult to it to *add* any thing to it, or to mix any thing with it, as of equal authority with it for the teaching of doctrinal Truth. As the ancient Father said, "Malè in Dei lacte gypsum miscetur ‡."

Besides, Scripture not only asserts its own perfectness, but expressly repudiates all additions. The Divine Testaments tolerate no Human Codicils. Specially do they protest against *Traditions*, as a sufficient ground for *articles* of *Faith*. Our Lord says, that the imposition of Traditions as authoritative in matters of belief, vitiates the worship of God. "*In vain* do they worship Me, teaching for *doctrines* the *commandments* of *men* §."

You may indeed say, and you do say, that *your* Traditions are *not* "the commandments of *men*," but

* 1 Cor. iv. 6. † James i. 21.
‡ Apud Irenæum, iii. 17. § Matt. xv. 9.

of *Christ Himself*, speaking by the voice of your Church, and specially of the Bishop of Rome, whom, in your opinion, He has constituted His Vicar upon earth. But we reply, and you allow, that Scripture is God's Word; and we are sure that God cannot be inconsistent with Himself, and that His Word is not "yea and nay *," but "all His promises are yea and amen;" and since Scripture asserts its own sufficiency, and rejects and condemns all claims of any other person or thing to equal authority with its own to constitute articles of Faith, therefore *that* authority which *does* make such a claim *cannot* really be of *divine* origin, however it may pretend to be so.

Christ also warns us that "many false prophets will arise, and *come* in *His name*, and deceive many;" . . . and He bids us "go not after them †." Therefore, we think, that the assertions of the Church of Rome, that its Traditions are from Christ, and are sufficient of themselves to establish articles of Faith, without Scripture and beside it,—although Christ's Apostles say, "If any man preach any thing *beside* what we have preached, let him be accursed ‡,"—are plain demonstrations that in this respect Rome is acting the part of a *false* Prophet; and that, if we follow her, we shall disobey Christ, and be rejected by Him.

* 2 Cor. i. 18. † Matt. xxiv. 6. 10. Luke xvii 23.

‡ See above, p. 41.

Further still; when Rome declares her Traditions to be sufficient to establish articles of Faith, and then proceeds to anathematize us because we cannot receive doctrines thence derived, which she would impose upon us as terms of communion, and as necessary to everlasting salvation *; and when she requires men to affirm *on oath* †, that without belief in these doctrines *no one can be saved*, although she does not deny, and cannot deny, that some of these doctrines were not held by any Christian Church for a thousand years after Christ, we think that she is guilty of rending the Church by Schism, and of corrupting it by Heresy. We fear for her, lest her curses may recoil on herself. We fear for her, lest, if her delight is in cursing, it may happen unto her: lest, if she loves not blessing, therefore it may be far from her ‡. She curses us for not receiving her additions to the Scripture; but let her remember the dreadful curse pronounced against those who *make additions* to the Word of God §, and how much more, therefore, against all who curse others for not receiving the additions they have made; and not only so, but for not consenting to their *detractions* also in rescinding the commands of Scripture, which prohibits all such additions. "Si non est *scriptum*, timeat

* Forma Juramenti, containing the Trent Creed, and affixed to the Decrees of that Council by Pius IV. "Extra hanc fidem nemo salvus esse potest."

† Ibid.

‡ Psalm cix. 16.

§ Gal. i. 8. Rev. xxii. 18.

Væ illud *adjicientibus* aut *detrahentibus* institutum *."

Let me commend these statements to your serious consideration; and may God bless them to the peace and happiness of your soul.

I am Sir,

Yours, &c.

* Tertullian adv. Hermog. 22.

LETTER VI.

"Alius manu scripturas, alius sensus interpretatione intervertit. . . . Tantum veritati obstrepit adulter sensus quantum corruptor stylus."—TERTULLIAN de Præscr. xxxviii. 17.

MY DEAR SIR,

St. Jerome* says of Origen, on account of his *allegorical* mode of interpreting Scripture, that "facit ingenium suum Ecclesiæ Sacramenta,"—he makes Sacraments of the Church out of his own wit; and in another place he does not scruple to call him† a "delirus interpres." Nor is St. Jerome less severe on *his own* early exegetical works: he tells us ‡, that in his youth he was delighted with this figurative method, and that he employed it in a Commentary which he wrote on the Prophet Obadiah. This effort of his juvenile intellect was very much

* Præf. in Esaiam, cap. xiii. See also in cap. vii. ad finem.
† In Hieremiam, cap. xxix.
‡ Præf. in Abdiam.

admired by many; but when he grew older, he was heartily ashamed of it himself. "Illi prædicabant," says he, "ego erubescebam."

Origen*, with all his labour, learning, and genius, —which were confessedly very great,—exercised a pernicious† influence by his allegorical mode, which made him almost lose sight of the *historical letter* of Scripture‡. He explained away all that seemed to him derogatory to the Divine dignity: and every thing which reflected discredit on the ancient saints,—for instance, on Noah, Abraham, and Lot,—was in his opinion not to be understood as *real*, but *typical*. In his hands the Mosaic account of the Creation was in great danger of becoming a parable§: he is therefore justly censured by Epiphanius, Basil, Chrysostom, and Augustine, and other pious and learned interpreters‖, some of whom had been fascinated with the Origenistic method in their youth, but lived long enough to see its injurious tendencies. Thus, for instance, St. Augustine commenced an Expository Work, in that style, on the Book of Genesis, against the Manichæans; but he did not prosecute it far, and when he returned to comment on the same

* Born in Egypt circ. A.D. 185, died at Tyre A.D. 254.

† "De divino Codice et egregiè et pessimè meritus," says Mosheim of Origen, Comment. de Rebus ante Const. p. 605.

‡ See Rosenmüller, Historia Interpret. Libb. Script. iii. 41—52; and Neander, Eccl. Hist. ii. 231, Rose's translation.

§ See Huetii Origen II. cap. 11. quæst. xiii.

‖ See Buddei Isag. p. 1582.

part of Scripture in riper years, he pursued a very different method of Interpretation*.

This allegorical mode of exposition, as the Patriarch Photius informs us, was derived from Philo the learned Jew of Alexandria, who lived in the first century of the Christian era; and was cultivated by some of the early Christian writers of the Alexandrine School, especially by Origen. The Jewish doctors, and even their historians,—Josephus, for instance,—allegorized their Law and their History, in order to render it popular with Greeks and Romans; and the study of the works of the Platonists, who were much in vogue at that time in Egypt, was also very favourable to the propagation of the allegorical method. Its vicious character showed itself very clearly in the wild extravagances into which it betrayed the Therapeutæ among the Jews, and the Gnostics among the Christians. The excesses of the former startled even Philo: and the immoralities of the Simonians†, and the heretical dreams of the Valentinians, which were engendered by Allegory, were with great difficulty put to flight by the learning and wisdom of Irenæus.

* See his Retractationes, I. cap. 18.

† Hammond. Diss. 1. contra Blondell. cap. 7, § 4. "Simonis asseclæ γνῶσιν, i. e. Scripturæ Sacræ *mysticè* interpretandi facultatem sibi arrogantes multa V. Test. mysteria ad impuros suos usus accommodabant." "It must be confessed (says Neander, ii. p. 234) that the Alexandrine principle, carried to the extreme, might lead to an idealism, subversive of all that is historical and objective in Christianity." See also Bp. Marsh, on the Interpretation of the Bible, Lectures VI. and IX.

Widely different from the Alexandrine School of Hermeneutics, was that of the Syrian Antioch, the birth-place of the Evangelist St. Luke, the Episcopal See of St. Peter, and St. Ignatius. There the *literal* system prevailed. One of the most eminent of its early expositors was Diodorus, first a Presbyter and afterwards Archimandrite of Antioch, and Bishop of Tarsus, A.D. 378; under him were formed Theodore, Presbyter of Antioch, and afterwards Bishop of Mopsuestia, (who died A.D. 429,) called the Teacher of the whole Church by Theodoret*. He wrote a work "Concerning Allegory and History, against Origen." Another very eminent member of the same school, John, surnamed Chrysostom, or Goldenmouth, from his eloquence, was born at Antioch A.D. 354, and was Presbyter of that city, from which he was afterwards translated to the Patriarchal Chair of Constantinople. His exegetical works are among the most precious remains of Christian Antiquity. Thomas Aquinas used to say that he would not part with Chrysostom's Homilies on St. Matthew for the town of Paris†. These, as well as his other commentaries, are composed in the literal, historical, practical style, though he did not altogether neglect the figurative. Theodoret was a fellow-citizen, contemporary, and schoolfellow,—and also, as some say, a pupil,—of Chrysostom. He was born about A.D.

* πάσης Ἐκκλησίας διδάσκαλος. E. H. v. 40.
† Bartholini de Legendis Libris, V.

390, and consecrated Bishop of Cyrus in Syria about A.D. 425. He wrote commentaries on both Testaments, which are not exceeded in value by any thing produced by the ancient Expositors. He united the typical method with the literal; and, as well as Chrysostom, may be said to have followed a middle course between the manner of Origen and that of Diodorus of Tarsus*.

The Author of the "Essay on Development" is lavish in his eulogies on the Alexandrine or Origenistic school, and not less unsparing in his censures on the Antiochene or Diodorian† He does not scruple to say, that the "*mystical*‡ interpretation and orthodoxy will stand or fall together:" he charges the Antiochene School with Nestorianism as its natural result§; forgetting, as it seems, that Pope Victor expressly declares that Artemon was the originator of Nestorianism‖ (ἀρχηγὸς Νεστορίου); and he does not appear to bear in mind that the heresies of Apollinarius and Eutyches may be traced with at least equal fairness to the teaching of that of Alexandria.

He brings *other* charges against the *literal* Interpreters. Thus, for example, "according to it," (he does not scruple to say,) "Christ was divided from His Saints, and so the Saints were divided from Christ, and an *opening* was *made* for a *denial* of the doctrine

* Rosenmüller, l. c. iv. p. 36.
† See pp. 281—292.
‡ P. 324.
§ P. 290.
‖ Concil. Labbe, i. p. 602.

of their *cultus**;" as if, my dear Sir, the worship of Saints *was* a tenet of the Early Church! and as if "an opening was *made*" for its rejection, by the teaching of an *heretical* school! And what is the counterbalancing benefit which the Essayist derives from the *opposite* or allegorical school? He has the *privilege* of believing that Saint-Worship may appeal in its support to the words of the Psalmist, "*Laudate Dominum in Sanctis Ejus*, and *Adorate scabellum pedum Ejus*†." These are the precious fruits of Allegory!

These, my dear Sir, he calls Developments *from* Scripture; but most persons, I should suppose, would term them Developments *against* Scripture. Scripture requires itself to be interpreted "according to the proportion of faith‡;" and therefore the Church of England declares, that "no one place of Scripture" is so to be expounded "that§ it be repugnant to another." But this figurative mode of interpretation by its own fantastic notions concerning the meaning of one passage of Scripture, would destroy the plain teaching of the whole; like the Bath-col of the Rabbis, which subverts the Word of Inspiration.

Again: the Essayist says‖, that "certainly some of the most cogent passages brought by moderns against the *Catholic* doctrine of the *Eucharist*" (he

* Essay, p. 286. † Psalm xcix. 5. Essay, p. 112.
‡ Rom. xii. 6. § Art. XX. ‖ P. 287.

means the *Roman* doctrine of *Transubstantiation*) "are taken from writers who are connected with this (the literal) School;" that is, the Syrian Divines are inconvenient witnesses against it, as well as against Saint-Worship. Of this, indeed, I feel no doubt, that *if* Transubstantiation *had been* really "the *Catholic* Doctrine of the Eucharist" in the fourth century, then the most eminent members of this school, St. Chrysostom and Theodoret, who speak in the most unequivocal terms in *opposition** to it†, must have been branded and *excommunicated* as *heretics*. It is absolutely impossible that, with the numerous enemies who pursued both Chrysostom and Theodoret to their death, and even after it, no one should ever have brought the charge of heterodoxy on this point against them, *if* Transubstantiation had been then the received doctrine of the Eucharist. And this argument becomes still stronger when it is remembered that these testimonies of Chrysostom and Theodoret are

* Chrysostom, in his Epistola ad Cæsarium, inserted by Emeric Bigot, in his edition of Palladius, Paris, 1680, but suppressed by the Doctors of the Sorbonne, (who ordered the leaves in which it was printed to be cut out from the copies,) and reprinted, with Bigot's Preface, by Archbishop Wake, in his "Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England," p. 146—163. Lond. 1686.

† The passages of Theodoret, on this point, from his Dialogue Eranistes, cannot be presented more clearly to the English reader than they have been by Bp. Pearson, in his notes to the Exposition of the Creed, Art. III. p. 162. "From them" (says Bishop Pearson) "it is observable that the Church in those days understood no such doctrine as Transubstantiation."

found in *controversial* works against the Apollinarian and Eutychian heretics, who certainly would not have lost this opportunity of retorting the charge of heresy against them, *if* Transubstantiation had been the doctrine of the Church. Indeed one of your divines* says that Chrysostom may be excused, because Transubstantiation was not developed then. Since also Pope Gelasius† (A.D. 492—496) used precisely the same arguments on the same subject in the Western Church, as Chrysostom and Theodoret had done in the Eastern, we cannot doubt what the judgment of Christendom then was on this subject; and you, my dear Sir, will have to allow that your infallible Judge was a heretic, if Transubstantiation is true.

But to return to the subject of Expositions. The plain fact is, that when the Essayist says, that "mystical interpretation and *orthodoxy* will stand or fall together," the orthodoxy of which he is speaking is that of the modern Church of Rome. Mystical

* Gamachæus ap. Albertinum de Eucharistia, ii. p. 553. "Excusari posse quod Transubstantiatio non *ita perspicuè* tradita et explicata *sicut hodie*." Gamachæus ascribes Chrysostom's work to another John of Constantinople, at the end of the sixth century; so that he allows the development not to have taken place two hundred years *after Chrysostom*.

† In his Treatise, "De duabus Naturis in Christo," where he combats the Eutychian doctrine of a confusion of Natures in Christ, by referring to the Sacrament of the Eucharist; in the same way as Theodoret and Chrysostom had done. The words of Gelasius will be found in the notes just cited of Bp. Pearson.

Interpretations are precisely those in which she rejoices. Allow her to allegorize, and she will prove any article of her Creed from any verse of the Bible. Therefore she makes her young Ecclesiastics learn by heart the two monkish lines*, in which, in contempt of all prosody and orthodoxy, she sings,

> "Litera gesta docet; quid *credas, Allegoria;*
> Moralis, quid agas; quo tendas, Anagogia."

"Quid *credas, Allegoria;*" this is her axiom, which agrees with the Essayist's assertions, that "Scripture is the medium in which the mind of the Church" (always meaning the Church of *Rome*) "has energized and developed;" that she evolves her doctrines from Scripture; but then it is from "the *spiritual* or *second* sense of Scripture†," and "the definitions of the Church rest upon definite, even though sometimes obscure, sentences of Scripture‡;" of which *Laudate Dominum in Sanctis*, already cited as an authority for Saint-Worship, is a specimen§.

* They will be found in her Theological Summaries; e. g. Dens, ii. p. 99. Perrone, ii. 1149.

† P. 327. "The use of Scripture, especially its *spiritual* or *second sense*, as a medium of thought and deduction, is a characteristic principle of *the developments of doctrine in* the Church." See also p. 319. "The mystical interpretation of Scripture is one of the characteristic conditions or principles on which the development of doctrine has proceeded. Again, *Christianity* developed, as we have incidentally seen, in the form, *first*, of a *Catholic*, then *of a Papal Church*. Now Scripture was made the rule on which this development proceeded in each case, and Scripture moreover *interpreted in a mystical sense.*"

‡ P. 112.

§ Ibid. p. 112.

Here again we are shocked by the reckless and infidel *destructiveness* which characterizes Popery when carried to its ultimate results. Doctrines (we are told) develope themselves by degrees: if we ask, From what elements are they evolved? the reply is, From Scripture. But if we inquire, How understood? in its literal sense? No, by no means; such interpretations lead infallibly to heresy; but in a figurative and mystical one. And who shall develope that? The "one living, infallible Judge,"—the Pope.

Such is the *practice* of *Rome*, and such is the theory of the Essayist. In further proof of this, let me refer to *some* of these "definitions or received judgments" of the Church of Rome, which, we are told, "rest upon definite, but obscure, sentences of Scripture."

This mode of developing from Scripture is exemplified (says the Essayist) "in the structure of the *Canon Law*, and in the *Bulls* and *Letters* of *Popes**." To these, then, let us resort for instances of the application of the theory. Pope Innocent III., (who dethroned our King John,) in one of his *Bulls* has given a *spiritual* Scholium on the text of Genesis, (i. 14.) "God made two great lights." These words (says that Pope) "signify that God made two dignities, the Pontifical and the Royal; but the dignity which rules the Day—that is, the *Spiritual* Power—is the

* Essay, p. 321.

greater Light; and that which rules the Night, or the Temporal, is the Lesser; so that it may be understood that there is as much difference between Popes and Kings, as between the Sun and Moon *."

Take another sample; Pope Boniface VIII., in one of his *Bulls*, comments on the tenth verse of the first chapter of the Prophet Jeremiah, and throws in by the way some unique specimens of biblical Interpretation. The verse is as follows, "See, I have this day set thee over the Nations, and over the Kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy." "Here," exclaims Boniface†, "the Almighty is speaking of the power of the Church, to create, and to judge the Temporal Power; and if the Temporal Power swerves from its duty, it shall be condemned by the spiritual; and since *Peter* said to Christ, 'Ecce duo gladii,' 'Lord, behold, here are *two* swords‡,' therefore the Pope has *both* the temporal and spiritual swords at his command; and since also Moses writes§, 'In *principio* Deus creavit cœlum et terram,' and not 'In *principiis*,' therefore there is only *one* Princedom, and that is the Papacy!"

What wonders may not be expected from the developing powers of your hermeneutic Thauma-

* Decret. Greg. IX. lib. i. tit. xxxiii. c. 7. tom. ii. p. 191, ed. 1829, Lips.

† Unam Sanctam, Extrav. Liv. i. tit. viii.

‡ Luke xxii. 38.

§ Gen. i. 1.

turge, who educes such marvellous things from the first two words of the Bible. If he will wave his wand, a College of Cardinals may start forth from the stars, as the Pope has leapt from the sun. He may give away kingdoms by a gloss; and dethrone princes by a marginal note. It was, you know, on the strength of one of these expositions that Pius V. deposed Queen Elizabeth, and absolved her subjects from their allegiance, in 1570*.

From Gen. i. 27, "God made man in his own image," Pope Adrian argued that images may be set up in Churches†; and because the heavenly voice said to Peter, "Arise, Peter, kill and eat," therefore if Cardinal Baronius is to be believed, the Pope had a right to devour the Venetians‡.

At the Lateran Council, Pope Leo X. profanely allowed the text "Ecce venit *Leo* de tribu Juda," to be applied§ to himself; and Martin IV., in a public Consistory, permitted the Sicilian Ambassadors to say to him without rebuke, "Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi, miserere nobis;" and at the opening of the Council of Trent, the Bishop of Bitonto‖, in a set speech, said, "Papa Lux venit in mundum, et homines dilexerunt tenebras magis

* See the preamble to his Bull, dated v. Kal. Mai. 1570.
† Whit. et Duræus in Camp. 9. Reason, p. 269.
‡ Cardinalis Baronii Votum contra Venetos.
§ By the Bishop of Modrusia.
‖ Sarpi, Istoria, p. 165, ad ann. 1546.

quàm lucem;" and this oration was printed by papal authority, as was the impious address to Leo the Xth of the Archbishop of Patraca, in the last Lateran Council, in which he applied to Leo* the text, "Omnis Potestas mihi data est in cœlo et terra;" for,

> "——— Nihil est quod credere de se
> Non possit cum laudatur Dis æqua potestas."

Such are a few specimens of the application of the *non-literal* and *non-natural* method of Interpretation by the Roman Pontiff, to whom you commit the power of developing Doctrines; and concerning whose Expositions, one of your Cardinals † says, "If any one has the Interpretation of the Church of Rome concerning any text of Scripture, although he does not understand how the Interpretation suits the text, habet tamen ipsissimum verbum Dei." On these principles we shall be required to give up our Greek to the learned Romish Canonist, who derives ‡ the word *Cephas* from Κεφαλὴ, and thus proves the Pope to be the *Head* of the Church, and our Latin to the Postil-writer, who shows from the text, "*Hæreticum devita* §," that heretics are to be deprived of *life*. This would be quite as rational as to surrender all Languages and Learning,

* Session 10.
† Cardinal Hosius, De Expresso Verbo Dei, p. 623, ed. 1584.
‡ Gloss. Antiquorum de Pœnitentia.
§ Titus iii. 10. See Erasmus, Encom. Moriæ, p. 213, ed. 1676.

Ancient and Modern, Human and Divine, to the will of the Pope, the blind leader of the blind, who seems infallible only in making men fall into the ditch,—and then bids them affirm that he alone can see.

And now, in sober sadness, you, my dear friend, must permit me to inquire, Is it to be borne that such barbarous wrestings and rackings of Holy Scripture as these, of which St. Peter's expression στρεβλοῦν τὰς γραφὰς, (2 Pet. iii. 16,) to put the Scriptures to torture, is very descriptive, should be called Expositions, when they are "glossæ viperinæ," which eat out the very *vitals* of the text? Rather, is it not a monstrous outrage on the sanctity of Divine Truth, that it should be thus mangled; and that they who put it on the wheel of their own pride should be called its faithful Protectors?

But this is not the whole of the mockery to which they expose Scripture. The Church of Rome not only claims the power of interpreting Scripture as she pleases, at one time, but of *varying her own* interpretations from time to time. Scripture, in the words of her doctors, is a "nasus cereus *," and it is "*cereus* in *vitium* flecti" in her hand; pliable, and

* Pighius de Hierarch. Eccles. lib. iii. fol. 103, ed. 1558, and in Controv. Ratisb. loc. 3, p. 90, ed. 1549, "Sunt Scripturæ velut *cereus* quidam nasus, &c." Both these works are dedicated by the Author to Pope Paul III. In his Hierarch. p. 211, *b*. the Scriptures are called "plumbea regula."

pliable to ill. She promises to give us Expositions according to the sense of the Fathers, and commands her Clergy to swear that they will not interpret Scripture except according to their uniform consent *; and yet, with strange inconsistency, she orders them to swear also that they will only interpret it "according to the sense of the Church, (i. e. of the *existing* Church of Rome,) whose office it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of Scripture †."

Now observe what your divines deliver concerning the sense of the Church in interpreting Scripture. Scripture is as changeable as the Moon; and the Church of Rome is the Sun to enlighten it. For example: Cardinal Cusanus (as I have before said) teaches us that "it is not surprising if the Church interprets Scripture at one time in one way ‡, and at another time in another way: for understanding advances with custom, and making progress with custom it is the life-giving Spirit:" and he ventures

* Pius IV. Forma Juramenti. "Nec Scripturam unquam nisi juxta unanimem consensum Patrum accipiam et interpretabor."

† Ibid. "Juxta eum sensum quem tenuit et tenet Sancta Mater Ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione sacrarum Scripturarum."

‡ Cusani Epistola 7, p. 857. "Nec mirum si praxis Ecclesiæ uno tempore interpretatur Scripturam uno modo, et alio tempore alio modo; nam intellectus currit cum praxi: intellectus enim qui cum praxi concurrit est Spiritus vivificans." See also the opinions of Cusanus, as quoted by Sarpi, Istoria, p. 163. "L'intelligenza delle Scritture si debbe *accommodare* al *tempo* e non altremente intese il Concilio Lateranense."

to assert that this is no *change* at all; for, says he, the "power of the Church is not less than that of Christ*;" and the Church is animated by His Spirit, and it does nothing but what He wills;" so that however the *form* of Scripture, so interpreted, may vary, there is no change in its *substance*†.

The Church of Rome, therefore, does not conform herself to the Word of God, but makes the Scripture attend her pleasure. Scripture in her hands is not a fixed rule of faith, but changes with the time; that is, her own sense, exhibited in her practice, varying from time to time, is the true Exposition of Scripture‡. Scripture is only the echo of the Papacy,

— "Vaticani
Montis Imago."

---

* Cusani Epistola 2, ad Bohemos, p. 833—835, ed. Bas. 1565. "Etiam si hodie *alia* fuerit interpretatio Ecclesiæ, (says he of *half-communion*,) tamen hic sensus, *nunc* in *usu* currens, ad regimen Ecclesiæ inspiratus, uti *tempori* congruus, ut *salutis via debet acceptari*." Cardinal Cusanus has given in this letter a sketch of the "Theory of Development;" and he there in the most unqualified manner resolves every thing into the authority of the *existing* Church of Rome.

† Cardinal Cusanus, ibid. p. 834. "Dicetis forsitan, præcepta Christi mutabuntur auctoritate Ecclesiæ? ut sint tunc obligatoria quando Ecclesiæ placuerit? Dico *nulla* esse *Christi* præcepta quàm per *Ecclesiam* pro talibus accepta . . . et non hæc est *mutatio*."

‡ Bellarmine de Sacr. ii. 25. "Omnium dogmatum firmitas pendet ab auctoritate *præsentis* Ecclesiæ;" and Pighius says, Controv. iii. p. 91, "Nullâ Scripturarum apparentiâ abduci nos oportere a communi *observatione Ecclesiæ*, quæ est *ipsissima Christianæ* veritatis regula."

Thus, for example, it was *once* the true sense of Scripture that no creature should be worshipped; and the Collyridians were condemned as heretics by the Church for worshipping the Virgin Mary *; and the Council of Laodicea † anathematizes those who worship Angels; but *now* the Church of Rome worships the Virgin and Angels, and therefore the precept, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God," and "Him only shalt thou serve ‡;" and, "see thou do it not, worship God," the words of the angel to St. John falling down before him, have lost their force, and what *was* Idolatry *is now* Religion. We find also that Image-Worship was established by the Second Nicene Council, on the plea that it was the *practice* of the existing Church §.

So, again, it *was* the doctrine of Scripture that all men are conceived and born in sin, but it is the *practice* of the Church of Rome to celebrate the Festival of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, and therefore Original Sin is no longer, in her case at least, an Article of Faith ||, but the contrary.

So, again, it was *once* the real meaning of Scripture, that all communicants should receive *both kinds*, for it was once the *practice* of the Church of Rome to administer both kinds, and Pope Gelasius con-

* Epiphan. adv. Hæreses, lib. III. tom. ii. p. 1064, ed. Petav.
† Canon XXXV. ‡ Matt. iv. 10. Rev. xxii. 9.
§ See Concil. Labbe, vii. pp. 838. 863. 886, 887.
|| See the arguments of the Tridentine Bishops, in Sarpi, p. 169—171.

demned the practice of *half-communion* as sacrilegious *; but the Church of Rome *now* administers but one kind, and therefore the meaning of God's Word has changed,—yes, what it once *commanded*, it now *forbids*. Nor is it content with *forbidding;* but any presbyter who communicates the people in *both kinds* may be delivered over to the Secular arm as a *heretic* †: and we must follow the *practice* of the Church of Rome, and believe it to be the true exponent of Scripture ‡.

But, my dear Sir, in opposition to all this unhappy sophistry, let us remember the declaration of Scripture, that the Faith § was once for all (ἅπαξ) delivered

* "Grande sacrilegium," A.D. 492. Jus Canon. Comperimus, de Consecratione, dist. 2. c. 12.

† The language of the Council of Constance, A.D. 1414—1418, is most explicit on this matter, and exhibits a most striking practical specimen of Development in all its anti-scriptural destructiveness. The following are its words (Sess. XIII. Labbe, vol. xii. p. 100):—"In nomine Sanctæ et Individuæ Trinitatis . . Amen. Hoc præsens Concilium Sacrum generale Constantiense in Spiritu Sancto legitimè congregatum, decernit, quòd *licet Christus* discipulis administraverit sub *utráque specie*, . . tamen *hoc non obstante, consuetudo* est rationabiliter introducta, quòd, *licet* in primitivâ Ecclesiâ reciperetur sub *utráque* specie, *posteà a laicis* tantummodo sub specie panis recipiatur" —therefore any presbyter who administers in both kinds is "ut *hæreticus* coercendus, invocato etiam ad hoc, si opus fuerit, *brachio seculari.*"

‡ "For some *wise purpose*, doubtless," (says Mr. Newman, p. 366,) "such as that of showing the power of the Church in the dispensation of Divine grace, as well as the perfection and spirituality of the Eucharistic Presence, the Cup is withheld from all but the celebrant in the Holy Eucharist."

§ Jude, ver. 3.

to the Saints; and that a part of this Faith is that the Sacraments are divinely instituted means of grace, and that the participation in them, full and entire, is necessary to salvation. The denial of the cup to the laity is irreconcileable with this article of Christian doctrine. In the words of Christ *,— "From the beginning it was not so;" and of His Apostle, and all the Primitive Apostolic Churches, "We have no such custom, nor the Churches † of God." What then? When the Apostle says, "Let him that interpreteth ‡ Scripture (ὁ προφητεύων) interpret according *to the proportion of the Faith*" (τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως), that is, according to the system of doctrine delivered by Christ and His Apostles, and received from them by the Church, it follows that the denial of the cup to the laity, and the other Romish practices, to which I have just referred, which are contrary to the Faith as propounded in Scripture and exhibited in the public language and practice of the Primitive Church, are violations of St. Paul's precept, and are acts of rebellion and despite against the Holy Spirit Who dictated it, and against the Divine Lawgiver, "Who, only," as St. James says §, "is able to save, and to destroy."

In these and in other respects, the Church of Rome has done precisely that for which our Blessed Lord condemned the Pharisees of old. "Laying aside the

* Matt. xi. 8.
† 1 Cor. xi. 16.
‡ Rom. xii. 16.
§ iv. 12.

commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men*." "Ye have made the Word of God of none effect by your tradition, which ye have delivered; and many such things do ye†." . . . Nay, more, not only does she thus render the Word of God of none effect, but she even ascribes His oracles to the dictation of the *Evil One*. Cardinal Hosius‡ says, "That which the Church (of Rome) teaches is the express Word of God; and that which is held contrary to the sense and consent of the Church, is the express word of the Devil." So that if we believe that Christ commands us to§ receive in both kinds, saying, "Drink ye all of this; and except ye drink my blood, ye have no life in you;" as the Church of Rome herself once taught and practised, we should obey Satan, and not God‖!

Oh! my dear Sir, let me implore you to remember the words of Him Who said, "Every plant which

* Mark vii. 8. † Matthew xv. 6. Mark vii. 13.

‡ Cardinal Hosius de Expresso Verbo Dei, p. 643, 622, 623. "Quod Ecclesia docet expressum Dei verbum est; quod contra sensum et consensum Ecclesiæ docetur, expressum Diaboli verbum est." Idem, p. 624. "Vanus est labor qui *Scripturæ* impenditur, *Scriptura* enim creatura est et egenum quoddam elementum." . . . So the Jesuits of Cologne, in Censurâ Coloniensi, fol. 132. "If any man examine the Pope's doctrine by Scripture, and contradict it therefrom, let him be rooted out with fire and sword." Walsh's Irish Remonst. Treat. iv. p. 61.

§ Matt. xxvi. 27. John vi. 53.

‖ Cardinal Hosius, p. 627. "Est ordinatio seu observantia Christi corporis Ecclesiæ ut sub *unâ* specie communicetur? Vult *Satanas* sub *utráque*." Cardinal Hosius was specially patronized by Popes Paul IV. and Gregory XIII., to whom he dedicated his works.

My heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up *."

You, and other good men like you, in *France*, speak often, with good reason, in terms of the greatest alarm and abhorrence of the results arising from rationalistic Principles in *Germany*. One of the most pernicious tenets of the Neologists beyond the Rhine is thus expressed by themselves:—"We are convinced that Jesus Christ is one and the same to-day, yesterday, and for ever; that He is the Lord of the Church; but this Lord is nothing else but His Spirit *within us*. His Spirit is the Judge of all things; and this Spirit is ever with His Church. She finds in her foundation and in her history, the clue that conducts her through the labyrinth of human error and the *rule of the development of her doctrine*. Christianity renews itself in the human heart, and follows the development of the human mind, and invests itself with new forms of thought and language, and adopts new systems of Church-organization, to which it gives expression and life. The *Scriptures* and the Creeds are the witnesses of *ancient* Christendom. Being, however, the *works* of *men*, they express the faith of *men;* and their form bears the impress of the time in which they were made. It is not in *them* that absolute truth resides, but it is in the *Spirit* of truth, holiness, and love, which animates mankind. He who revealed Him-

* Matt. xv. 13.

self to the world by the authors of the Scriptures is *in us* and *by us;* He interprets the same Scriptures, and judges of their truth."

Such is the language which was addressed, a little more than a year ago, by a great metropolitan municipal body * to the Sovereign † of Prussia on his throne, with the assurance "that the great majority of *educated* persons in his capital participate in the same opinions." You, I am sure, can hardly read it without an inward shudder; and I am persuaded you will agree with me, that *if* Scripture is a *human* composition; if it is *temporary* and *variable;* if it is to be judged and interpreted by a spirit within *us*,—instead of *our* spirit being tried by it, and being conformed to it; *if* thus, in a word, according to the old Protagorean doctrine ‡ (which has been developed in an infinite variety of forms) "man is the measure of every thing to himself," then all objective truth,

* The Municipality of Berlin, Oct. 2, 1845.

† The learned and able Dublin Professor of Moral Philosophy, Professor Butler, Irish Eccl. Journal, iii. p. 307, has shown the similarity of Kant's teaching with that of the "Essay on Development." The latter destroys Christianity by the adoption of new doctrines, the former by the renunciation of old; while both pretend to *preserve* the *Spirit* entire. So, too, he proves that the Essayist and the "great Patriarch of Rationalism" agree perfectly on the necessity of mystical interpretation. See also Mr. Palmer's valuable collection of documentary evidence to the same effect, p. 91; and the Rev. E. H. Dewar's interesting and instructive volume on German Protestantism, pp. 5—8.

‡ On which see Plato's Theætetus, and Cudworth on Immutable Morality, pp. 42 and 67. See also Perrone, Loci Theologici, ii. p. 1265.

whether moral or dogmatic, is *gone for ever*, and we must soon be the victims of the wildest licentiousness of opinion and practice, which will make the world a ruin.

But let me now inquire—Are *these* teachers the *only* destroyers of Faith and Morals? are not *they* also chargeable with precisely the same offence, who command us to submit implicitly to the so-called divinely-inspired Spirit of "*one* living Infallible Judge," or "Developing Power?" Can men have *fixed* articles of faith and morals in *this* system any more than in the other? No. "*Unus utrisque Error, sed variis illudit partibus.*" There is the same evil in both, but it operates in different ways: in the former, every one developes for himself; in the latter, the Pope developes for every one. *Both* are *alike* destructive of true social and civil liberty and safety. We may repeat of *both* what Augustine says of the Manichæans, "They weigh matters not in the unerring balance of Scripture, but in the false one of *their own devices* *." *Both* dishonour the Word of that Divine Being, with Whom there is "no variableness or shadow of turning," and Who has said, that "the grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away, but the Word of the Lord endureth for ever †." Both are warring against Revelation, and are fighting under the banner of Infidelity. *You* look with fear on the progress of Rationalism; and what hope can

* Aug. c. Ep. Parmen. iii. c. 2. † 1 Pet. i. 24.

any man derive from that of Romanism? The same reasons, which induce you to augur the worst results from the one, ought at least to prevail upon you to look charitably on us who are resolved, with God's help, to contend earnestly against the other.

Let me say a few words concerning *our* principles of Scripture Interpretation, and I will conclude this letter.

"I hold it" (says Richard Hooker*) "for a most infallible rule in expositions of Sacred Scripture, that where a *literal* interpretation will stand, the farthest from the letter is commonly the *worst*. There is nothing more dangerous than the licentious and deluding art, which changeth the meaning of words as alchymy doth or would do the substance of metals, maketh of any thing what it listeth, and bringeth in the end *all truth to nothing*."

The writer of these words is speaking especially of those heretics who would explain away the words of our blessed Lord, "Except a man be born again of *water* and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God †," and who would give them a mere *figurative* signification involving no precept for the outward administration of baptism. He rightly asserts that nothing is more fatal to truth than interpretations like these. But what Hooker here maintains against certain heretics respecting Baptism, may be justly alleged against Romanists in regard to the

* Eccl. Polit. V. lix. 2. † John iii. 5.

other Sacrament. "Except a man be born again of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," may as well be wrested to prove that water baptism is not necessary, as "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you," and "Drink ye all of this," be allowed to mean, as the Church of Rome *requires* that it should mean, "*None of you shall drink of it;*" and if the non-recognition of the necessity in the one case be heresy, much more is the *actual prohibition* in the other.

The *allegorical* mode of Interpretation, so much lauded by the Essayist and practised by Rome, has ever been a favourite resort of *Scepticism;* and here, as in many other respects, Rome and Infidelity make common cause. An English author of our own age, whose works have been translated into your language, and lauded by some for *logical accuracy*, comments in the following terms on certain words of our Church Catechism *:—"The Devil and all his works." "Exists there," he asks, "any where any *real* Being to which this name is applicable?" Then, having recollected that Scripture often speaks of such a Being, he says, "Not by unbelievers only, but by many a pious Christian, is the existence of any such Being as the Devil utterly *denied*—the sort of Being mentioned under this name being no other than an *allegorical* one; the passages in which mention is

* Bentham on the Church Catechism, p. 9, 1817.

made of him so many purely *allegorical* and *figurative* expressions; he is figurative, and upon a line with Jupiter and Juno, and the other inhabitants of the classical heavens." Thus the Unbeliever, borrowing from Rome her metaphorical method, allegorizes Satan into a mythical character; and, at the same rate, Heaven may be only another name for Elysium, and Hell for Phlegethon and Styx.

The Romish Bishop, Dr. Milner, in his work entitled the "End of Religious Controversy *," dwells on the extravagances to which persons are carried who affirm that every man ought to be "his own Interpreter of Scripture," and he concludes his remarks on this subject with citing the well-known lines of Dryden †:—

> "As long as words a different sense will bear,
> And *each man be his own interpreter*,
> Our airy Faith will no foundation find,
> The *Word's a weathercock to every wind*."

It is remarkable that precisely the same sentiment, expressed nearly in the same words, had been applied, fifty years before Dryden's poem, by a learned Anglican writer ‡, to the Method of Biblical Interpretation employed by the Church of *Rome*, which, says he, by her Expositions "makes of the Scripture a *weathercock*, which *turns about with every*

* End of Controversy, Letter viii.

† Hind and Panther, Part i.

‡ In a very ingenious volume entitled the Beehive of the Romish Church, Lond. 1623, p. 82.

wind." I am not concerned to defend the false principle against which Dr. Milner is writing. With every faithful member of the Church of England I reject it. I have before shown that Scripture is indeed the Rule of Faith of the Church of England, but it is Scripture, *not* interpreted by every man in every age according to the varying caprice of the individual and the time, but Scripture interpreted by Reason, and by the Practice of the Church Universal in and from the earliest times; and whatever doctrine can be shown to have been unknown to Christian Antiquity, or condemned by it, we reject as either unnecessary or false, and not to be imposed on any one as the sense of Scripture, and obtruded as an article of Faith.

But of this I am fully persuaded, that all that Dr. Milner has written against the evils of Private Interpretation, may be, and *must be* applied to *his own Church;*

"Mutato nomine de *Te*
Fabula narratur."

There, "The Word's a weathercock to every wind" that blows from the cave of the Papal Æolus; and the world's history bears too much evidence that if the Roman Pontiff has any object of aggrandizement in view—if the Juno of his ambition tempts him with the bribe of a Deiopeia, he is ever ready to let forth an Eurus or a Zephyrus, as may best suit his purpose, and Scripture is made to veer about

like a vane with the fickle gusts of his arbitrary will. This is clear from the Interpretations cited from Papal Bulls and Decretals in this letter. Miserable, indeed, is the state of Society, where every man, woman, and child, set up to be an Interpreter of Scripture, but not less wretched are they, where the Pope is every man's Interpreter. No one can interpret Scripture worse for himself than the Pope has done for him. The strangest neologistic ravings of a Bretschneider or a Strauss have been equalled if not exceeded in extravagance by many of the oracular Expositions which have proceeded from the chair of the Vatican.

Permit me, in conclusion, to ask one question; the Bishop of Rome founds his claim to Infallibility and Supremacy mainly on the promise of our Lord to St. Peter—which is blazoned in large letters round the inside of the dome of St. Peter's, "And I say also unto thee, Thou art Peter, (*i. e.* a stone,) and on this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it *." This sentence was addressed to St. Peter in consequence of his good confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." Now, what I would inquire is,—since Christ's promise to Peter is grounded on Peter's confession of Christ,—*if* Peter sets himself against Christ and in the place of Christ, and (pardon the expression) if he ceases to be *Peter* and becomes

* Matt. xvi. 18.

Antichrist, is not Christ's promise void? The Bishop of Rome claims to be the successor of Peter; be it so; *but* he does not confess Christ, he obeys not Christ's word, but subverts it by his own, he destroys Peter's foundation; and what then does our Lord say of him? "Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man which built his house upon a *rock* . . . and every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man which built his house upon the *sand*: and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house, and it fell, and great was the fall thereof*."

I am, dear Sir,

&c. &c.

* Matt. vii. 24—27.

LETTER VII.

"Interroga generationem pristinam,
Et diligenter investiga Patrum memoriam.
Hesterni quippe sumus et ignoramus,
Quoniam sicut umbra dies nostri sunt super terram.
Et ipsi docebunt te ;
Loquentur tibi, et de corde suo proferent eloquia."
Liber Job. viii.

My dear Sir,

The greatest scholar, and one of the best of men, who ever adorned your country, I mean Isaac Casaubon*, says, in one of his letters to his friend Daniel Heinsius, "I desire with Melanchthon and with the Church of England, that the doctrines of Christianity, derived from the source of Holy Scripture, should be deduced through the channel of Antiquity. Otherwise, what end will there be of novelties?" And again, in a letter to your learned Cardinal Perron, written in the name of our King James I., he says, "The King, with the

* Epistola 744, ed. Roterod. 1709. Casaubon was born at Geneva in 1559, but passed the greater part of his life in France.

Church of England, declares that he recognizes that doctrine as true and necessary to Salvation, which, flowing from Holy Scripture, has been derived to our times through the consent of the Ancient Church as by a channel . . . His Majesty readily allows that if the testimony and authority of the Primitive Church is set at nought, there can, humanly speaking, be *no end* to religious *controversy*. He is not speaking of *Rites* and *Ceremonies*, but of *articles* of *Faith;* and he affirms that whatever ought to be regarded as necessary to Salvation is to be proved from *Holy Scripture alone*, and does not depend on any human authority, but on the written Word only, by which God has revealed His Will to us through the Holy Spirit. The Fathers of the Church, and the Ancient Church generally, enjoyed the right of *deducing* articles of Faith from Scripture, and of explaining them, but not of *making any new article*. This was the sense of all the ancient Doctors of the Church; as can easily be shown from their writings*."

Again, one of our most learned Prelates, a Professor of Theology in one of our Universities, and a Prolocutor of our English Convocation, Bishop Overall, thus declares the judgment of the Church of England in a letter to Hugo Grotius†, "Our divines hold that the judicial power of declaring articles of Faith belongs to Councils of Bishops and

* Epistola 838.

† A.D. 1617. Epistolæ Præstant. Viror. p. 486.

other learned Ministers of the Church, chosen and convoked for this purpose, according to the practice of the Ancient Church, and grounding their judgments on Holy Scripture, explained according to the consent of the Ancient Church, and not according to any private neoterical Spirit."

I would also request your attention to the following words of one of our most learned and admired Theologians, Dr. Waterland*. "If there is any Church (he says) now in the world which truly reverences Antiquity, and pays a proper regard to it, it is the Church of England. The Romanists talk of Antiquity, while we observe and follow it. For with them both Scripture and Fathers are, as to the sense, under the correction and control of the *present* Church; with us, the present Church says nothing but under the direction of Scripture and Antiquity taken together, one as the Rule, and the other as the Pattern or Interpreter. Among them it is the present Church that speaks, though in the name of Scripture and the Fathers; with us, Scripture and the Fathers speak by the Church."

Again; "We allow no doctrine as *necessary* which stands only on *Fathers:* we admit none for such but what is contained in Scripture, and proved by Scripture, *rightly interpreted;* and we know of no way

* On the Use and Value of Ecclesiastical Antiquity, in vol. v. p. 318, of Bp. Van Mildert's edition, Oxford, 1823; compare vol. x. p. 487.

more safe in necessaries to preserve the right interpretation than to take the Ancients along with us: we think this a good method to secure our *Rule of Faith* against *impostures of all kinds*, whether of enthusiasm, false criticism, conceited reason, oral tradition, or the assuming dictates of an '*Infallible Chair.*' If we thus preserve the *true sense* of Scripture, we build our Faith upon *Scripture only;* for the *sense* of *Scripture is Scripture.*"

Such, my dear Sir, is the language of our best divines concerning Scripture and Antiquity. We do not regard the Fathers as exempt from human infirmities. We do not deny that blemishes, both as respects doctrine and practice, may be found in their works. Therefore we are far from regarding them as a Rule of Faith. No. Scripture is our only Rule; and our Church teaches that "whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to Salvation*." But then she considers that the Fathers are of excellent use in the *application* of this *Rule.* She does not believe that any doctrine, which may be now alleged to be deducible from Scripture, and which can be shown to have been unknown to them, is a true doctrine, or *can rightly* be called the *sense* of *Scripture.* In the

* Art. vi.

words of Bishop Bull*, "We have, and ever shall have, a dread of interpreting Scripture against the *torrent* of all the Fathers, except when most evident Reasons compel us to do so; which we think will *never be the case.*" Again; as Bishop Stillingfleet† says, "It is sufficient prescription against any thing which can be alleged out of Scripture, that, if it appear contrary to the sense of the Catholic Church from the beginning it ought not to be looked upon as the *true* meaning of Scripture." In this respect, we hold that the writings of the Fathers are invaluable. They are admirable expositors of *ancient truth;* and they are something more than this; they are sure preservatives against *modern error.* They are faithful keepers of the old Catholic faith; and they are no less effective safeguards against the new Trent Creed.

If we can prove that any doctrine was unknown to the primitive Church, we are sure that it could not have been taught by Christ and His Apostles, and that it therefore cannot be necessary to salvation; and we affirm that in the Trent Creed there are many doctrines which were unknown to the primitive Church, and therefore are not doctrines of Christ, and not necessary to Salvation.

The author of the Essay on Development attempts to get rid of this argument by a very novel experiment,—the introduction of *Chance.* He alleges that

* Def. Fid. Nic. i. 1. 9.

† Rational Account, ii. 59.

the silence of Primitive writers concerning Romish doctrines is not conclusive against them*; for the "law of silence is often simply unaccountable." In one part of his work† he rejects the *disciplina arcani*, as it is called, by which some Romanist Divines explain the non-appearance of certain of their doctrines in the works of the Early Fathers of the Church‡, alleging that the Fathers *held* those doctrines, but did not *teach* them, and that Christianity had from the first both an esoteric and exoteric character, the one distinct from the other. According to *this* theory, this or that doctrine of the Church was like an Alphëus which ran for a long way under ground, till at length it emerged, in this or that age, in the Arethusa§ of a synodical canon, or a decretal of a Pope. But in subsequent paragraphs‖, the Essayist argues (as I have said) that "the law of silence or deficiency is often *simply unaccountable.*" "Thus Lucian" (he says) "hardly notices Roman authors or affairs. Maximus Tyrius, who wrote several of his works at Rome, makes no reference to Roman history. Paterculus, the historian, is mentioned by no ancient writer except Priscian. What is more to our present purpose, Seneca, Pliny the elder, and Plutarch, are altogether silent about Christianity,

* P. 139. † P. 25.

‡ See Schelstrade, Dissertatio Apologetica de Disciplina Arcani, 1685, contra Tentzelium.

§ Virg. Æn. iii. 694. ‖ P. 139.

and perhaps Epictetus also, and the Emperor Marcus. The Jewish Mishna, too, compiled about A.D. 180, is silent about Christianity; and the Jerusalem and Babylonish Talmuds almost so, though the one was compiled about A.D. 300, and the other A.D. 500. Eusebius, again, is very uncertain in his notice of facts: he does not speak of St. Methodius nor of St. Anthony, nor of the martyrdom of St. Perpetua, nor of the miraculous powers of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus. . . . . Josephus* is silent about Christianity, and Eusebius passes over the death of Crispus in his life of Constantine." The inference from all this is stated as follows in another page†:—"It is true that St. Ignatius is silent in his Epistles on the subject of the Pope's authority; but if that authority was not and could not be in *active operation*, then such silence is *not so* difficult to account for as the silence of Seneca or Pliny about Christianity itself, or of Lucian about the Roman people. St. Ignatius directed his doctrine according to the need." . . . "For St. Ignatius to speak of Popes when it was a matter of Bishops, would have been like sending an army to arrest a housebreaker‡."

It would seem, therefore, that, according to the Author's view of the case, the Papal power might have existed, though not in active operation, even from the Apostolic age; and that the fact of St. Ignatius not referring to that Power is not so strong a

* P. 141. † P. 165. ‡ P. 167.

proof against the existence of the Papacy as the silence of Seneca or Pliny against the existence of Christianity, or as the silence of Lucian concerning it is against the existence of the Roman people! Let us examine these assertions.

The Papacy is the fundamental article of your system. St. Ignatius was writing letters to Christian Churches, one of which was Rome, concerning their duties to their spiritual guides; and the very reason which leads him to dwell so much on the necessity of obedience to their *Bishops, must, à fortiori,* have induced him to speak of the submission due to the Supreme Pontiff, the *Bishop of Bishops—if* any such Ecclesiastical Ruler had existed in those times. This is *our* assertion; and this is one of the many examples we adduce of the great, the inestimable, value of the Writings of the Early Fathers, as *præscriptiones* (to use Tertullian's word) against modern Romish heresy and schism; especially against the great source of schism, and the arch-heresy of heresies, the doctrine of the Papal Supremacy and Infallibility.

But the Essayist says that Ignatius *might* have been aware of the *existence* of the Papacy, and yet *might* say nothing about it, as "Lucian is silent about the Roman people:" and in accordance with the Doctrine of Development, that in the time of Ignatius the Papacy "was not and could not be in *active operation;*" that "first the power of the Bishop *awoke,*

then that of the Pope;" that "Christianity developed itself first as a Catholic, then as a Papal Church;" and therefore it would have been idle for Ignatius "to speak of Popes when it was a matter of Bishops:" so that Ignatius says nothing about Popes, not because they *were* not — but because they were *asleep!*

Sleep, Sir, is not characteristic of Popes. They are possessed with a perpetual *agrypnia.* If we believe their own assertion, their power consists in Universal Supremacy over all Pastors and People. Cancel an iota of this claim, and the Papacy is not. Therefore, when he says that the Papacy was not in "active operation" in the time of Ignatius, he allows its non-existence; and for *our* parts we are quite content with the form of Church Government which existed in the days of the holy Martyr Ignatius, the disciple of St. John, and the true successor of St. Peter*.

But "the law of silence (we are told) is often simply unaccountable." The Pope *might* have existed, and Ignatius say nothing about him; and we are assured that there are other examples of *reserve* quite as strange as this. Let me then say a few

* At Antioch. While speaking of the See of Antioch I may observe, that the Essayist has fallen into an anachronism concerning Severus, the famous Monophysite Patriarch of that city, to whose history he gives several pages. In p. 312 he says, "Severus, Patriarch of Antioch at the end of the *fifth* century." Severus was not Patriarch till A.D. 513.

words on the *supposed* parallels between the silence of Ignatius concerning Popes, and that of some other writers concerning celebrated persons and things, known to have existed in their time. This examination will furnish us with a specimen of the character of the statements and reasonings of the "Essay on Development," and will, I think, induce you to pause before you place any reliance on them, without careful inquiry. Your faith, I assure you, will be much imposed upon if you receive them implicitly.

First, then, the author says in the passage above cited, "*Lucian hardly notices Roman authors or affairs.*" This is a very strange assertion. Lucian speaks *very frequently of Roman** affairs. Τὰ Ῥωμαίων ὁράτω†—"let him survey *Roman* affairs," is his precept to his Historian, and

Νοστήσεις Ῥώμην καὶ Θύμβριδος ἱερὸν ὕδωρ‡,

says he in a work, which he addresses to Celsus, the famous *Roman* Epicurean; and he entitles one of his dialogues with the name of *Nero*, the *Roman* Emperor§.

Secondly, "*Maximus Tyrius* (we are told), *who wrote several of his works at Rome, makes no reference to Roman History.*"

You would suppose from these words, that in

* i. 13. ii. 389. iii. 168. 672, &c. ed. Amst. 1743.
† ii. 61. ‡ ii. 235. § iii. 636.

several works which he wrote at Rome he makes no mention of Roman History. But are you aware that the Essayist *never saw* "*several* of his works?" that only *one* of them exists, and that this is composed of Greek dissertations, some at least of which were delivered in *Greece**, and that they are *all* on philosophical subjects, such as the genius of Socrates, the summum bonum, the theology of Plato, the Philosophy of Homer. What wonder then that he should say nothing of *Roman History?* You might as well be surprised that Locke does not quote Moliere, nor say any thing of the Merovingian Dynasty in his Essay on Human Understanding. Surely the law of Silence is not very unaccountable here.

Thirdly, "*Paterculus the historian is mentioned by no ancient author except Priscian*†."

This is another mistake. Paterculus *is* quoted by the Scholiast on Lucan, ix. 178, as Ruhnken has observed‡; and they who have leisure for such inquiries may perhaps find some other notices of him in other authors. I say *perhaps*, for it will not be at all surprising if they do *not*, because Velleius was never very much read; whence we may account for the fact that only one MS. of his history survives.

* Diss. xxxvii. τότε κηρύττομαι ἐν τοῖς Πανέλλησι. "Heinsio videtur (says Harles, Fabric. v. 518) majorem ætatis suæ partem in locis Asiæ et Græciæ transegisse."

† Annales Velleiani, § 30.

‡ Præf. ad fin.

Fourthly, "*Seneca, Pliny, and Plutarch, are altogether silent about Christianity.*"

It is very strange that *this* silence should be called "unaccountable," when it had been accounted for by St. Augustine fourteen hundred years ago; "Seneca (says he) does not mention the Christians, lest he should either praise them against the custom of his country, or blame them (probably) against his own will*:" this reason has been considered quite sufficient by your best writers, for instance by Tillemont†.

Fifthly, "*Perhaps Epictetus also, and the Emperor Marcus* (Aurelius), *are silent on Christianity.*"

As for Epictetus, the fact is, *none* of his writings are extant; for the Enchiridion or Manual, which goes by his name, is nothing more than a collection of his sayings strung together by his scholar Arrian, the Bithynian soldier. It is quite true, then, that Epictetus, *as far as we know*, is silent about Christianity, as he is about *every thing else*, except so far as Arrian speaks for him in a little volume of about thirty octavo pages: but there is *another* work by Arrian, called Dissertations, which some suppose to have been also compiled from Epictetus, and *there* he is *not* silent on Christianity; he mentions the Christians, and calumniates‡ them as Galilæans.

* De Civ. Dei, vii. 11.
† Histoire des Empereurs, i. 340. ii. 274, ed. 1702.
‡ Lib. iv. § 7.

Again: Marcus Aurelius is *not* silent about Christianity: it would have been much more for his credit if he had been; for he speaks of the constancy and courage of Christian martyrs as if it were mere obstinacy*, somewhat in the same manner as Pliny the younger treats the matter in his Epistle to the Emperor Trajan†.

Sixthly, "*The Jewish Mishna, too, compiled about* A. D. 180, *is silent about Christianity; and the Jerusalem and Babylonish Talmuds are almost silent about Christianity, though the one was compiled about* A.D. 300, *and the other* A.D. 500."

This is another strange observation. The Jewish Mishna, or Second Law, falsely claims, as you know, to be the record of oral communications made by God to Moses on Mount Sinai, and transmitted by Moses to Joshua and the Prophets after him. It would not, therefore, have been at all unaccountable *if* it had been silent about Christianity.

The Talmud consists of the Mishna and Gemara, that is, of oral traditions and their interpretation; and the same reason which hinders the Jews from seeing the Messiah of the Christians in their *written* Word, might well have prevented them from giving Him a place in the *un-written*, or in their own inter-

* Lib. xi. § 3. κατὰ ψιλὴν παράταξιν ὡς οἱ Χριστιανοί. Besides this, Neander, in his Church History, i. p. 105 (Rose's transl.), has shown reasons for ascribing an edict against *Christians*, to Aurelius.

† Ep. x. 97.

pretations of it. We might as soon have expected frequent mention of Christianity in the Mythographi Latini as in the Jewish Talmud. But—after all, notwithstanding this—is it *true* that there is no mention of Christianity in the Talmud? The Essayist appears to have been misled by Dr. Paley*, from whom his remarks are transcribed almost verbatim. But the truth is, that the Talmud *does* contain blasphemous expressions against *Christianity:* though partly through the vigilance of Christian censors, and partly through the fears of Jewish editors, these expressions have been removed from our editions of it †.

Seventhly, "*Eusebius is very uncertain in his notice of facts: he does not speak of Methodius nor of St. Anthony.*"

No great wonder; as your Church-historian Tillemont‡ has shown; for St. Methodius was an enemy of Origen, who was as strenuously defended by Eusebius. As for St. Antony, Eusebius in his Evangelical Demonstration§ speaks in general terms of the

* Evidences, chap. vii. p. 70, ed. 1821.

† The learned and unfortunate Orientalist, Simon Ockley, thus writes, in his book De Linguis Orientalibus, p. 106, ed. 1706. Cantab. "Quatuor sunt *Talmudis* editiones, Veneta, Basileensis, Amstelodamensis, et Francofurtensis ad Oderam, verum *omnes castratæ*, priores duæ a censoribus, tertia ab ipsis Judæis, qui *resecant* quæ in *Christianam religionem* et *Salvatorem Nostrum blasphema* sunt, nec audent in nostris regionibus vulgare. Posterior Francofurtensis cæteris magis integra est."

‡ v. 201, ed. 1732. § i. 8.

first Eremites; and if he does not speak specially of St. Antony, we need not be much surprised, when we remember the parts taken by the Saint and the Historian respectively in the cause of St. Athanasius.

Eighthly, "*Eusebius does not speak of the martyrdom of St. Perpetua, nor of the miraculous powers of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus.*"

How does the Essayist know this? We have not all or nearly all the works of Eusebius; particularly "His Book of Martyrs," mentioned by St. Jerome *, and to which Eusebius himself refers in his "Ecclesiastical History †," as *supplementary* to that work, is now lost; and it is very probable that St. Perpetua *was* mentioned *there*. As for Gregory Thaumaturgus, Eusebius ‡ mentions him as the most celebrated of the disciples of Origen at Cæsarea. Ruffinus, the ecclesiastical historian, the translator and defender of Origen, not being satisfied with the silence of Eusebius, inserts in his translation of Eusebius an account of some of the acts of Thaumaturgus §; and it may be supposed that the Origenistic controversy, which swayed men in different directions at that time, was not without its influence, in contrary directions, on the mind of Eusebius and his Translator.

Ninthly, "*Josephus is silent about Christianity.*"

* De Viris Illust. c. 81. † H. E. v. 4. 15. 21, &c.
‡ vi. 30. ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐπισκόπων διαβόητος Γρηγόριος.
§ vii. 25.

Here is another assertion in which the Author presumes on a most wonderful degree of ignorant belief in his readers. Who is there, of moderate historical knowledge, who has not heard of the celebrated passage in the Antiquities of Josephus * concerning Christianity? and though some persons have raised doubts about it, yet what theologian knows not that it is quoted as genuine by Eusebius †, Hegesippus, and Jerome in their controversial writings with Jews? Who is ignorant that its genuineness has been maintained by the most learned men in your nation and in ours,—by Casaubon, Valesius, Usher, and Pearson ‡; and yet with the most perfect calmness the Author says, "Josephus is silent about Christianity!"

Tenthly, "*Eusebius passes over the death of Crispus in his life of Constantine.*"

I have already mentioned the Essayist's obligations to Dr. Paley in these paragraphs: and from him I will borrow a sentence, which it is clear that the Essayist had seen (indeed he refers to it), when he was gathering his examples of *inexplicable omissions*. It occurs in the context of what I have quoted from that author's "Evidences," concerning the Talmud. "I think it may with great reason be

* xviii. 3.

† Professor Lee has lately given to the world a new citation of it by Eusebius, Theophania, p. 329.

‡ See Archdeacon Churton's Edition of his Minor Works, i. 319. 332. ii. 25. 33.

contended" (says Dr. Paley) "either that the passage of *Josephus* is genuine, or that his silence is *designed:* perhaps he did not know how to represent the business, and disposed of his difficulties by passing it over *in silence. Eusebius* wrote the life of Constantine, yet *omits* entirely the most remarkable circumstance in that life—the *death of his son Crispus—undoubtedly for the reason here given.*"

I have thus gone through *ten* assertions, nine of them taken consecutively from a *single half page* of the "Essay on Development." You will pardon, I trust, the trouble I have given you in carrying you through these details; but I was desirous of showing you once for all how little claim the Essay has to be regarded as a correct representation of *facts;* and since its main design is to show that Popery is "*historical Christianity* *," I thought it a duty to prove that the "Essay on Development" is not *Christian History*, and that a writer who founds the claim of Romanism to be regarded *as* historical Christianity on such assertions as these, has gone far to prove it to be as fabulous as Greek or Latin Mythology.

Again, it was my desire to show that the silence of Ignatius concerning the Papacy is indeed unaccountable on any other supposition, except the true, viz. that *in his age* it *did not exist;* and it is my opinion that the alleged examples in which the

* P. 1—29.

author has attempted to find parallels for the silence of Ignatius, only afford additional proof that this silence is inexplicable, if the Papacy is true *.

Having thus shown by an example the use which we make of Primitive Christian Antiquity, I proceed to observe, in further illustration of what I am now saying, that our learned Bishop Jewel, who was no vain boaster, did publicly, at St. Paul's Cross, London, in the year 1560, on the second Sunday after Easter, make a challenge to his Romanist adversaries, that if any learned man among them "would bring any one sufficient sentence out of any Catholic Doctor or General Council, for the space of six hundred years after Christ, in support of the twenty-six several doctrines, cited by him, in which the Church of Rome differs from the Church of England, and which the former affirms to be necessary to salvation, he would give over and subscribe to him." So confident was the Bishop—"the worthiest divine that Christendom had bred for the space of some hundreds of years," as Hooker † calls him—that in those doctrines in which Rome now differs from England, she differs from *her ancient self;* and that, therefore,

* It would not be surprising if, under these circumstances, some Romanist Divines should be tempted to dispute the genuineness of the Ignatian Epistles,—indeed a Dublin Reviewer has done so, No. xxxvi. p. 367. But let those Divines be reminded, that supposing, for argument's sake, that those Epistles were not written in the second century, but in the fourth or fifth, then the argument against the Papacy as a *modern* corruption becomes still stronger than before.

† E. P. II. vi. 4.

we, at our Reformation, did not sever ourselves from her, but that she had separated herself from the ancient Catholic Church; and that the guilt of the schism between us lies at her door.

It is an argument of a bad cause when an adversary abandons the ground on which he once mainly rested, and begins to decry what he formerly employed as his principal ally. Rome *once* appealed to Antiquity; but *now* she reviles it. If a Jewel were now to reiterate his challenge, she would elude it by saying, "Let the Church of England hold the faith of the Primitive Church, yet this profits her nothing; for the ancient Fathers were ignorant of many truths which have *now* become articles of Faith!" Again; *we* may prove that the Church of Rome imposes many articles as necessary to salvation, of which the Church of the first six centuries knew nothing; but this, we are now assured, is a proof not of her corruption, but of her *vitality!*

This, then, is the question—Is Antiquity to share the fate of Reason and of Scripture at the hands of the Church of Rome? Was the early Christian Church ignorant of any fundamental doctrines of the Christian Faith?

This is a large and comprehensive inquiry; but it may be reduced into a tolerably narrow compass. Happily the Essayist has specified the objections which he has to make to the teaching of the primitive ages; and, taking the most prominent points

of his pleading against them, I think that I shall be able to show, that, so far from inflicting any damage upon them, he has rather corroborated their authority. If, after all his researches, the allegations he has to bring against them form the total of his charge, they have little to fear for their reputation; and if they should amount to ten times this aggregate, we have nothing to fear for our Christianity. His argument is, that some of the Fathers speak ambiguously or erroneously, or are altogether silent, on certain doctrines allowed by *us*, as well as by the Church of Rome, to be parts of the true Faith; that, therefore, the truth of these doctrines was not established in primitive times; and that we do not *refute* this or that doctrine of the Church of Rome, when we show that it was not held by the Early Church: in short, that we cannot reject the doctrines of Trent, without renouncing those of Nice *.

First, let me observe, that there is one extraordinary fallacy in this argument, which completely vitiates the whole. It sets out with an *ignoratio elenchi*. It proceeds on the supposition that we make the Fathers our *Rule of Faith;* whereas, as I before said, the Church of England knows of no other rule of Faith than Scripture; and the authority which it accords to the Fathers is not a *legislative* but an *interpretative* one. We believe the articles of the Nicene Creed, *not* because they were held by such

* See p. 9.

or such Fathers of the Church, but because they may "be proved by most certain warrants * of *Holy Scripture* †;" and because, being so proved by the Fathers of that Council ‡, they have ever since been

* Bp. Sanderson in his Fifth Sermon ad Clerum thus speaks, "The orthodox bishops and doctors in the ancient Church being to maintain the Trinity of Persons in the Godhead, the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, the hypostatical union of the two natures in the person of Christ, the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, and other like articles of the Catholic religion against the Arians, Eunomians, Macedonians, and other heretics, had recourse often to the tradition of the Church, whereby they meant *not* any *unwritten* doctrine not contained in Scriptures, but the *very doctrine of the Scriptures themselves, as they had been constantly understood and believed by all Christians in the Catholic Church, down from the Apostles' times till the several present ages wherein they lived.*"

† Art. VIII.

‡ At the Sessions of Councils of the Church, and, we may well suppose, at that of Nicæa, the Scriptures were placed on a throne § in the Council Chamber, to show that they were the *νόμος βασιλικὸς* —the royal rule—of the Church. Wheatley, on the Nicene Creed, p. 82, ed. 1738, "Whenever any Councils were held of old, a throne was erected in the midst of the assembly, on which the Gospels were solemnly laid, that all might know upon what authority their decisions were to be built, from what principles their conclusions were to be drawn." Nothing can be more certain than these two points; (1) that Councils did not propound their decrees (*quatenus* their decrees) as a *Rule of Faith;* for, as Augustine says (lib. ii. c. 3, de Baptism. c. Donat.), "Provincialia Concilia *emendari* possunt per Plenaria, et Plenaria *priora* per *posteriora;* (2) that (in the words of Hooker, II. v. 4) "to urge any thing upon the Church as part of that supernatural truth which God has revealed, and not to *show it in Scripture,* that did the *Ancient Fathers* evermore think *unlawful, impious, execrable;*" and, therefore, S. Jerome says, in Epist. ad Galat., "Contra Spiritus Sancti doctrinam, quæ *canonicis literis* est prodita, si quid statuant *Concilia, nefas duco.*"

§ See the authorities in Bp. Cosin, On the Canon, p. 41.

received as true by the Universal Church, to which Christ has promised His presence and Spirit always, even unto the end of the world. What is it, then, to us, if it could be shown by a Petavius *, a Perron, a Newman, or a Dublin Reviewer †, that this or

* See Bp. Bull, Defensio Fidei Nicænæ, Procem. § 8; and Robert Nelson's "Letter to a Popish Priest," in Hickes's Letters, p. 334. "I am not ignorant that two of your great champions, Cardinal Perron and Petavius, have aspersed not only the Holy Scriptures, as incapable to prove our Saviour's divinity, but have impeached the Fathers of the first three centuries as tardy on the same point. Blessed God! that men should be so fond of human inventions, as to sacrifice to them those pillars of our Faith which are alone able and proper to support it,—Scripture and Primitive Antiquity."

† See the article in the Dublin Review of June, 1845, entitled "On the difficulties of the Ante-Nicene Fathers;" which anticipated the publication of Mr. Newman's work by more than three months. The object of this article is to undermine the authority of the *ancient* Church, and, if possible, to leave nothing standing but the Papal chair. Its animus may be sufficiently conceived by the reader from two notes, and from the concluding paragraph (pp. 369, 370). The two notes are as follows, p. 337: "The assertion that Bp. Bull's Work (Defence of the Nicene Creed) has never been answered, can only proceed from persons ignorant of Whiston's Primitive Christianity, and Jackson's Reply to Waterland, and Notes to Novatian, p. 353. The remains of Novatian were edited by Jackson, the learned Arian opponent of Waterland. He has added notes, for the purpose of showing how *all Primitive Antiquity* told *against* the Athanasian doctrine." The concluding paragraphs are:—"However discordantly the Fathers may to superficial readers" [i. e. to *all* readers, for why otherwise speak of the "*difficulties* of the Ante-Nicene Fathers?" which have not been cleared up by Bp. Bull, see p. 337, note] "seem to speak upon particular points of doctrine, in spite of their deep-rooted and solemn unanimity, there is *one truth* at least upon the very surface of their writings, and which penetrates to the very depths thereof, to which they, one and all, bear harmonious witness. They teach with a voice not to be mistaken" [not the sufficiency and supremacy of Scripture, but] "that the Church of

that Ante-Nicene Writer spoke ambiguously concerning this or that article of the true Faith? Our question is — Is the Article in Scripture or not? *γέγραπται*; *ἢ οὐ γέγραπται*; can it be *proved* from Holy Writ or not? Was it known to the Church before the Council, or was it then first published to the world? Concerning the Nicene faith, we assert that it *is* in Scripture; and we add, that it was known to be so before the Nicene Council; for this Council was composed of Bishops, three hundred and eighteen in number, and these Bishops did not start from the earth like myrmidons or like the soldiers of Cadmus, but they had received what they then promulgated as the sense of Scripture from their predecessors, and their Creed is an authentic proof of what they had been taught, and the *reception* of this Creed in all parts of Christendom, from that time to the present, has the force of a divine authority witnessing to its antiquity and truth.

What, therefore, I repeat, is it to us, *if* some, who might be employing their talents in a nobler task,

Christ" [i. e. of Rome] "is the divinely-appointed and *divinely-guided* Teacher of all truth; that she is the Spouse of Christ, and cannot become adulterous; that the Holy Ghost dwelleth with her, and speaks by her mouth." "Those who humbly receive her doctrine" [i. e. that of the *present* Church of Rome] "*cannot go wrong*;" but those who, under the pretence of reforming corruptions, plead the authority of *Scripture* and *Antiquity* against the received doctrine of the *present* Church [of Rome], are marked out by the Fathers of ancient Christendom as *enemies of God* and *destroyers of the souls of men*."

should be able to cast a shade over some of the venerable names of Christian Antiquity? The literary remains of the Ante-Nicene period are scanty and fragmentary, and it is inconsistent alike with charity and with equity not to credit their orthodoxy on the general testimony of the Church which possessed their works entire, and could judge of them by their oral teaching as well as by their writings; but, on the strength of some insulated passages or phrases, at this period of time, to charge them with ignorance or error concerning some article of Faith propounded in Scripture and proclaimed by a General Council early in the Fourth Century, and received by the Universal Church, — *this* is neither reverent nor just.

Again, whatever attempts may be made to discredit the orthodoxy of this or that Ante-Nicene writer, these aspersions, after all, can only affect the character of a *few;* and the Nicene Creed, received in *all Christendom*, still remains, as before, an indestructible monument of the Faith, not of a few, but of the Ante-Nicene, as well as the Nicene, Church.

But now let us apply these remarks to the *Tridentine* Creed. It is said by your Romanist Theologians, that *we* have not refuted those doctrines when we have shown that they were unknown to the Primitive Church of Christ, *except* we are willing to allow that *they* have refuted the Nicene doctrines by

showing that they were unknown to the Ante-Nicene Fathers *.

To this we reply, first, that neither Fathers nor Divines are our Rule of Faith. We accept the doctrines of the Nicene Council, because they can be proved from Scripture; and we reject those of the Tridentine, because they are contrary to it. The one decided κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς, "*according* to the Scriptures;" the other, κατὰ τῶν γραφῶν, *against* the Scriptures. The cases, therefore, are by no means parallel in this respect. Secondly, let us allow, for argument's sake, that some of the Ante-Nicene writers have spoken ambiguously concerning the Nicene doctrines; but then we say that *no one writer* can be cited in favour of some of the Tridentine tenets for a thousand years after Christ. Here, again, is a great difference between the two cases. Thirdly, the Nicene Creed was published early in the fourth century, and has ever since that time been received—that is, for fifteen hundred years—through-

* The Romish argument in Bishop Bull's words is (Def. Fid. Nic. Procem. § 5), "Concilia Œcumenica potestatem habere *novos* fidei articulos *condendi*, sive, ut Petavius loquitur, *constituendi* et *patefaciendi*, unde satis prospectum videatur additamentis illis quæ regulæ fidei assuerunt quæque Christiano orbi obtruserunt Patres Tridentini; quanquam ne sic quidem fides Romana stabit; cum *Tridentina Conventio* quidvis potius quam *generale concilium* dicenda sit." It is clear from these words that our great English theologian, Bishop Bull, saw very distinctly, a century and a half ago, that the essence of Romanism is *Development*.

out the whole of Christendom; but the Tridentine Creed was not promulgated till the sixteenth century, and it is *rejected* by the whole of the Eastern Church, and by a great part of the Western. Here, again, is another great difference. Fourthly, the Nicene Creed does not pretend to *add** any new Articles to the Faith *once for all* (ἅπαξ, Jude 3) delivered to the Saints, but to *declare* what it reads in Scripture, and has *received* from the Fathers before it; and Scripture anathematizes those who add any thing to the Faith. But the Trent Council added twelve new Articles to the Nicene Creed, some of which Articles it does not even pretend to find in Scripture, and none of them are contained in Scripture, and some of them are contrary to it; and one of them makes Tradition of *equal* authority with *Scripture*, and thus destroys Scripture; and so the Council incurred the anathema pronounced in Scripture on those who add new Articles to the Faith. Here is another great difference. Next, the Nicene Council was a Synod of the Church legally convoked, and its Bishops were under no sinister influence, but had perfect freedom of deliberation and decision; but the Council of Trent was not a Council of the Church, but only a Conclave of the Pope †, the

* Similarly, it is the language of the great Councils of Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, that they teach no other doctrine than what has been unalterably held from the beginning. See the quotations of Professor Butler, p. 342.

† See above, pp. 106—112, and the Letter of Andreas Dudithius,

Bishops there being all bound to him by an oath of implicit obedience, and being under the control of his Legates; and the Pope himself was one of the litigants, for the doctrine and discipline of Rome were the very subjects under consideration for which that Council was called, and therefore the Pope sat there *as Judge in his own cause.* He was, in fact, Plaintiff, Defendant, Advocate, and Arbiter; and so the decision was null. Here, too, is a strong contrast between Nicæa and Trent.

What we say, therefore, to your Theologians is this: Show us that your Tridentine Creed is read in Scripture, or may be proved thereby; show us that the Tridentine Council was a legal and free Council of the Catholic Church; show us that the Trent Creed has been received in all the Churches of Christendom; show us any single Father or Ecclesiastical Writer, for a thousand years after Christ, who held it; and *then* we shall be prepared to receive the Trent Creed as we receive the Nicene Faith, —but *not till then* *.

Episcopus Quinque-Ecclesiensis, ad Maximilianum II., printed in Brent's translation of Sarpi's Hist., p. 823.

* There is precisely the same fallacy in the Dublin Reviewer's Article "On the difficulties of the Ante-Nicene Fathers," above referred to, as in Mr. Newman's Essay. The former thus writes, p. 335, "We are called upon to give up all belief in Purgatory, to deny Transubstantiation, to refuse obedience to the Pope, and to leave off praying to the Saints, because they" [the Anglo-Catholics] "cannot see these doctrines in the Primitive Church, but find language in the Fathers which seems to them inconsistent therewith. . .

But I have not yet stated the argument in favour of the Nicene doctrines as strongly as it ought to be put. I have not yet shown that the allegations brought by the Essayist against the orthodoxy of some of the Ante-Nicene writers are very unjust. This I propose to do in my next letter.

In the mean time, I beg leave to commend to your consideration the following words of one of the most learned and pious Bishops of France, St. Irenæus, the noble martyr of Lyons, which will clearly show how strongly the Ante-Nicene Fathers protest against the notion that the faith was imperfect in their age, and that new doctrines could be added to it. "The Church" (says he) "having received this faith, which I have declared, guards it carefully as if she dwelt in one house, albeit she is dispersed throughout the whole world; and she maintains it as if she were animated with one heart and soul and spake with one voice; and neither will he who is most eloquent among her Pastors deliver any other

On our part (p. 337) we have no hesitation to maintain, that those who accept the doctrines contained in the *Athanasian* Creed, have difficulties to get over" [with regard to the language of the Fathers] "with which those" [Roman doctrines] "which they throw in our teeth as Catholics, cannot bear the *most distant comparison*." Waiving the latter question for the present, I would only observe, that the Reviewer seems to forget that our assertions are, that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation" (Art. VI.), and that the *Athanasian* doctrines "may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture" (Art. VIII.), and that the "*Romish* doctrine of Purgatory and Invocation of Saints, is grounded upon *no* warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the *Word of God*." (Art. XXII.)

doctrine than this, (for no one is above his Master,) nor will he who is weak in the word detract aught from the tradition. For since there is but *one* and the *same faith*, neither can he who is able to speak much concerning it, add to it; nor can he, who can say but little, take away from it *."

So far was your Irenæus from imagining that Developments were to be made in the doctrines of Christianity.

With what feelings of sorrow and surprise would *he* have regarded your two Translations of "the Essay on the Doctrine of Development," into the language of the country in which he fed the flock of Christ as a Bishop, and shed his blood for it as a martyr; and with what sighs, and tears, and groans of spirit would he have deplored the welcome given to the author of that book by an Archbishop and Bishops of France!

I am, Sir,

Yours truly,

&c. &c.

* Adv. Hæreses i. c. 3.

LETTER VIII.

"Quo spes, quoque ira vocâsset,
Ferre manum .... gaudensque *viam fecisse ruinâ*."
LUCAN i. 150.

MY DEAR SIR,

I proceed to examine the worth of the Essayist's imputations against the Ante-Nicene Fathers.

The first charge to which I desire your attention is the following. It is directed against the Provincial Council of Antioch; to which we are indebted for an Epistle, which for its matter and style may be regarded as one of the most precious remains of Christian Antiquity.*

The author† says, "There is one, and one only great doctrinal Council in Ante-Nicene times. It was held at Antioch in the middle of the third century, on occasion of the incipient innovations of the Syrian heretical School. Now, the Fathers then

* It will be found in Routh's Reliquiæ, ii. 465.
† P. 13.

assembled, for whatever reason, *condemned* or at *least withdrew* the word 'Homoousion*,' which was *received* at *Nicæa*, as the Special Symbol of Catholicism against Arius."

You would naturally infer from this allegation, that the Antiochene Fathers "condemned, or at least withdrew, the term 'Homoousion,'" understood in the *same sense* as that in which it was afterwards used by the Nicene Council. Otherwise the objection is frivolous, not to say disingenuous and unjust. Evidently, the conclusion at which the Author intends us to arrive is, that the Antiochene Council did not hold the true doctrine of the Consubstantiality of the Son with the Father.

This is a grave charge, aimed as it is not against one or two Fathers in their private capacity, but against a Synod which consisted of seventy Bishops.

Now, what I would first observe is, that this objection is by no means a new one, but was made by the Arians fourteen hundred† years ago, and has been repeated by their successors‡ up to the last century, and has been refuted by Catholic writers from the times of Athanasius§ to our own.

* *i. e.* Consubstantial; and, when applied to the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, "of one substance with the Father."

† See Athanas. de Syn. Arimin. et Seleuc. § 45.

‡ As Sandius, Nucleus Historiæ, p. 124.

§ Athanas. l. c. § 45. Bp. Bull, Works, ii. p. 81. Berriman on the Trinitarian Controversy, 119—124. Routh, Reliquiæ, ii. 317, 318. 465. 493.

It is a melancholy thing to see that the learned writer of the "Essay on Development" has not only fallen away from the Church of England to Rome, but in so doing has left the company of Athanasius and Hilary for that of Sandius and Leclerc.

Now for the *fact*. Did the Antiochene Fathers condemn the word "Homoousion?" Not to trouble you with many authorities, I beg to refer to an author against whom *you*, I think, can make no exception, the present learned Theological Professor in the College of Jesuits at Rome—Father Perrone.

"It is now agreed," says he*, "among the best critics that the *alleged* condemnation of the word 'Homoüsion' by the Antiochene Council is supposititious. This is certain from the fact that no mention was ever made of this condemnation till *ninety* years after that Synod was held, when the story was got up by the Semi-Arians, in the Council of Ancyra, A.D. 358."

But, further: we readily allowed that some great men of ancient times, for instance, Athanasius and Hilary, were induced to believe (whether correctly or no is not the question) that the Antiochene Fathers did reject, or at least withdraw the term Homoousion: but of this we are sure, that they never imagined that the Antiochene Fathers rejected the word *understood*

* Prælectiones, i. 567.

in the *same sense* as that in which it was afterwards used at Nicæa.

The occasions upon which the Councils of Antioch and Nicæa were summoned were very different. The former was convoked to suppress the heresy of Paul of Samosata, who denied the existence of Christ as a *Person* before His conception; the other was called to quell that of Arius, who confessed the existence of Christ before His conception, but only as a creature. The former was held to vindicate the plurality of *Persons* in the Ever Blessed Trinity; the latter to maintain the Unity of their *substance**. It would not be surprising, then, if, having met with a very different aim, the two councils should have used the same word in a different sense; and it is certain, that what some of the ancients believed the Antiochene Fathers to have really declined, was the term "Homoousion" used *not* in its Nicene and even Ante-Nicene sense, (for the word was used in its Nicene sense even before the Council of Antioch†,) but as employed in a *heterodox* sense by Paul of Samosata, who had wilily perverted the word to serve his own purpose; and if, therefore, the Fathers of Antioch had used it, he would probably have alleged that they had adopted his sense of it, and had acknowledged the consequences which he deduced from it.

This is clear from the words of St. Hilary.

* See Athanas. ibid. § 45. Bp. Bull, ii. 87.

† See the passages in Bull, v. 78—81. Routh, ii. 519.

"Some," says he, "have thought that the word 'Homoousion' should be rejected, because it seemed to involve the notion of a *third* substance, which the First and Second Persons of the Trinity share between themselves: but this is a false meaning of the word, and is proscribed as profane by the common consent of the Church. Secondly, you allege (he adds) that our ancestors rejected the word 'Homoousion' when they condemned Paul of Samosata for heresy: yes, and wherefore did they so? because by his *misuse* of the word, understood in the sense of identity of essence, he made the Father to be of the same *Person* with the Son. The Church regards this meaning as most profane; because it reduces the Father and Son to a *solitude* of *union and singularity;* and denies the propriety of each as a Person*."

It is plain, therefore, that Hilary did not believe that the Antiochene Fathers rejected the term Homoousion as it was afterward understood by the Nicene Council; it is clear that he thought they rejected it not in its orthodox sense of *consubstantial*, but in its *heretical* one of *co-personal:* and that he would have been greatly astonished by the assertion, that the "Fathers of Antioch condemned, or at least withdrew, the word 'Homoousion,' *which* was received at Nicæa as the special symbol of Catholicism."

* Liber de Synodis, § 81 and 85.

Let us see whether this charge would be better received in other respectable quarters.

St. Athanasius* and St. Basil affirm, that Paul of Samosata wished to rob the Church of the term "Homoousion," by abusing it (something, let me say, in the same way as Rome has attempted to deprive the Church of the word "*Catholic*," by appropriating it to herself): he, they say, sophistically alleged that if the Son is "Homoousios" with the Father, it would follow that there was some one common pre-existing substance and two distinct beings produced out of it; as two coins struck from the same metal; and thus not only the relation of the Father and the Son would be destroyed, but also the eternity of both: and therefore the Fathers of Antioch *abstained* from using a word, of which the meaning had been perplexed by the subtleties of a heretic, and which might therefore give rise to misrepresentation. Whether this act of *reserve* was a judicious one, I do not take upon me to determine; but certain it is, as St. Athanasius† affirms, that though the Council of Antioch did not use the same *word* as was employed by that of Nicæa, both the Synods were perfectly agreed as to the *doctrine*‡.

* S. Athanasius, de Synod. § 45 and 51. S. Basil, Epist. lii. (olim 300.) Bull, v. 36; and particularly v. 91, 92. Routh, Reliquiæ, ii. 487—489.

† Athanasius de Synodis, § 45. *πάντως εὑρήσομεν ἀμφοτέρων τῶν συνόδων τὴν ὁμόνοιαν.*

‡ In the words of Waterland (i. p. 330) to an Arian: "The An-

So much for your new convert's first attack on the credit of the Ante-Nicene Fathers; his second is not more injurious to their character, nor more creditable to his own.

"The six great Bishops and Saints* of the Ante-Nicene Church," says he, "were St. Irenæus, St. Hippolytus, St. Cyprian, St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, St. Dionysius of Alexandria, and St. Methodius. Of these, St. Dionysius is accused by St. Basil† of having sown the first seeds of Arianism."

Such is the charge. It appears to be borrowed, almost word for word, from the anti-Athanasian Whitby, who adduces it in two of his works‡. Let us now examine it. Dionysius, justly called the Great, was Bishop of Alexandria from the year A.D. 248 to A.D. 265. If then it be true, as Basil supposes, that he was the *first* to *sow* the *seeds* of *Arianism*, Arianism is not of primitive origin, nor could it have been known to the Church *before the middle of the third century.* This I observe by the

tiochene Fathers condemned the word Homoousion, as it had been misunderstood and misapplied by Paul of Samosata; but they established the *very same doctrine with the Nicene Fathers.*"

* P. 13.

† Basil, Ep. ix. 2. σχεδὸν ταυτησὶ τῆς νῦν περιθρυλλουμένης ἀσεβείας, τῆς κατὰ τὸ Ἀνόμοιον λέγω, οὗτός ἐστιν, ὅσα γε ἡμεῖς ἴσμεν, ὁ πρῶτος ἀνθρώποις τὰ σπέρματα παρασχών.

‡ De Scriptur. Interp. p. xxxi. Lond. 1714; and Disquisitiones Modestæ, p. ix. Lond. 1718. In both he cites the sentence of Basil: "Quo nihil expressius dici potuit," says he very complacently, "ad orthodoxiam Dionysii labefactandam."

way, as a very important fact, and a satisfactory refutation of the insinuations of your *Petavius*, Perron, Huet, and the *Dublin Reviewer*, who, making common cause with the *Le Clercs*, Clarkes, Whitbys, *Jacksons*, Whistons, and Lindsays, and other Arianizing writers*, would have us believe that the early Church was of their opinion on the great question of our Lord's Divinity.

Let us now look more closely at Basil's testimony. Observe, it is in no elaborate treatise or public homily that the passage occurs, but in a private letter which he is writing to his friend Maximus.

"You ask † (he says) for the writings of Dionysius. Many of them have come down to us; but I have *none* of *them by me*. But this is my opinion; I do not admire them all: some things which he has written I positively disapprove: he is the first, as far as I know, who sowed the seeds of the heresy now so rife among us, I mean Arianism."

But now mark, my dear Sir, what follows:—

"I attribute this (adds Basil) to *no fault of his own judgment* (γνώμη), but to a vehement desire of striving against (ἀντιτείνειν) the Sabellian heresy. For my own part, I am wont to compare him to an horticulturist, who, wishing to correct the distortions

* Jackson is called "the learned Arian opponent of Waterland" by the Dublin Reviewer (see above, p. 181); and the works of the Jesuit, Petavius, were republished, under an assumed name, by the coryphæus of Socinianism, Le Clerc.

† Ep. ix. 2, vol. iii. p. 90, ed. Benedict.

of a shrub, wrests it from the perpendicular by excess of reaction (ἀνθολκῆς ἀμετρίᾳ) into an adverse direction. Somewhat in the same way, Dionysius, in his violent opposition to Sabellianism, was insensibly carried away into an opposite error."

What, then, does the Essayist's allegation come to? Simply this: that in Basil's opinion, given off-hand to a friend, with none of the works of Dionysius before him, that venerable person was betrayed by his zeal for orthodoxy into some incautious expressions. What great wonder if this were the case? Who is there in the world so free from human infirmity, as to keep always the even line between opposite extremes: and because he may sometimes deviate from it, although he is ready to return to the right road, when admonished by a friend, shall he therefore be called a *heretic?* Who then is safe? Augustine is so zealous against Pelagianism, that he seems to some to approach the brink of Calvinism. Cyprian, and Ambrose, and Chrysostom, are so vehement against a barren Faith, that they have been called Arminians: shall they all be branded as heterodox? Certainly Basil had no such severe intention with respect to Dionysius. The Essayist would only have done common justice to both those venerable names, if he had mentioned that in another epistle Basil honours Dionysius with the epithet of the *Great**.

* Ep. 188, p. 269, ed. Bened.

But this is not all. Let me repeat, that we Anglicans do not speak of any of the Fathers as infallible. No: we say with St. Augustine *, "Scripture alone can neither deceive or be deceived; and we read the Fathers, not with minds made up to consider any thing true simply *because* they do, but because they are able to convince us of its truth, either by Canonical Scripture, or by Sound Reason." But we respect their opinion; and we greatly revere the collective judgment of the Ancient Church. Let us then inquire, did Dionysius escape the censure of the Church, when he used these equivocal expressions to which Basil refers? No. Great as he was styled, and as he really *was*, a holy champion of the Church against the Sabellian heresy, he was called to account for these questionable phrases; and he therefore addressed a letter to his namesake, Dionysius of Rome, to explain his real opinions, and to justify himself in the eyes of the Church. And this letter, as St. Athanasius informs us, was universally accepted as satisfactory †.

Let me now proceed to observe, my dear Sir, that this incident affords us the clearest evidence of the

* Epist. 82, ad Hieronymum.

† Athanasius, de Sententia Dionysii, § 14. 17, and 19. See Bp. Bull, v. 394. 409. 414. "Maximum virum Dionysium Alexandrinum blasphemiæ quàm Arius posteà propugnavit neutiquam favisse, sed de Filio Dei adeoque de SS. Trinitate catholicè omninò et sensisse et scripsisse abunde, ni fallor, evicimus." See also Waterland, v. 228.

scrupulous fidelity of the Ante-Nicene Church in the custody of the true faith, since even some casual expressions let fall in the heat of controversy by one of her greatest Doctors immediately excited her anxiety, and impelled her to require an explanation of the words so used. She could not have given us a better vindication of herself from the imputation of Arianism brought against her by certain of your Romish divines. We are not in any way concerned with the perfect orthodoxy of every one of the early Fathers, but we do venerate the judgment of the *Ante-Nicene Church:* and we rejoice in the testimony to her which is elicited by the Essayist's allegation against Dionysius. He has done no damage to the character of that venerable Father, and he has brought honour on the Church; whether he has enhanced his own credit by making this charge, or that of your Church in receiving him with such impeachments in his hands, I leave you to judge.

His next accusation is a still more heavy one; for it concerns no less than six of the most eminent Doctors of the Ante-Nicene Church, and it appears at first sight the more formidable, because the indictment is preferred in the name and words of one of the most learned Divines of the English Church, Dr. Waterland.

"The authors who make the generation [of Christ] temporary, and speak not expressly of any

other, are these following, Justin, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Tatian, Tertullian, and Hippolytus."—*Waterland*, vol. i. part ii. p. 104 *.

Who would not infer from these words, quoted without any qualification, that these writers did not believe in Christ's *eternal* generation from the Father, *i. e.* that they were infected with the Arian heresy, and that Dr. Waterland supposed them so to be?

But what is the fact? The Ante-Nicene Fathers speak of a *threefold generation* of the Son. 1. His *eternal* generation, as everlasting Son from Everlasting Father. 2. His *generation* in *time*, (for so it is sometimes called,) or condescension (συγκατάβασις) to create the World. 3. His filiation, also in *time*, as Man, from the Virgin Mary His Mother.

These two latter generations concern *us* men most intimately, and therefore it would be surprising if the early Fathers had not dwelt on them most frequently and earnestly; and it would not be wonderful if they should have said little on the more transcendental question of the *eternal* generation, *before* it was *denied* by Arius, when the case was altered, and *then* the Christian Writers became more frequent and copious in their assertion and explication of that truth †. But I would here observe, that *this* fact—

* Essay, p. 13.

† Hooker, V. xlii. 6. "Some good the Church hath reaped by the contentions of Arianism, in that they occasioned the learned and

I mean the habitual inculcation of this doctrine by the *Post-Nicene* Fathers, ought to be accepted as a proof of the belief of the *Ante-Nicene* to the same effect. The Creed of Nicæa is the best exponent of the tenets of the Ante-Nicene age.

Again: since the writings which remain to us of the Ante-Nicene age are but few in number, it would not be marvellous if we did not find any express testimony, in the fragments that survive of such or such an author or authors, to *any given* doctrine. But it would be extremely unfair to conclude thence, that those authors knew nothing of that doctrine. If all the Essayist's Works were lost, except his Work on Development, the opinions which posterity would form of his honesty and judgment, would be very different from that which we who know his *other* productions rejoice to be able to entertain.

Such is our *à priori* argument: now let us examine the fact; and as an appeal has been made to Dr. Waterland, as if he countenanced the opinion that these six Fathers were heretical in a vital article of the Faith, let us see what he really does say.

"After Arius arose, the Catholics found it necessary to insist much on the *eternal generation*. For the Arians taking advantage of it, that the temporary condescension of the Son to create the world had

sound in faith to explain such things as heresy went about to deprave."

often been *called* His *generation*, were for looking no higher, but artfully insinuated that this was the first production of Him. However the Arians might have known that the *eternal* existence of the Λόγος (or WORD) was *universally* taught, and even by those who asserted a *temporal generation* *."

You see then, my dear Sir, Dr. Waterland asserts that the eternal generation was *universally* taught by the Ante-Nicene Fathers ; taught, therefore, by those Six Fathers who are cited by the Essayist, and of whom he would have us to believe, that Dr. Waterland had affirmed that they knew nothing of any generation but the *temporal*.

But I will not dwell on Dr. Waterland's assertions alone. Bishop Bull has handled this same topic, and may be said to have exhausted it. His excellent biographer, Robert Nelson, the friend of your illustrious Bossuet, has drawn up a very lucid summary of that learned prelate's investigations ; and as it is very pertinent to the present inquiry, I request leave to transcribe it.

" In his Defence of the Nicene Creed, Bishop Bull hath proved †, That some Catholic writers more ancient that the Nicene Council, seem to attribute a certain *nativity* to the Son of God, as *God ;* but if their sayings are accurately weighed, saith he, it

* Waterland, i. 2, p. 114. See also ibid. p. 103. 134. 138—140. 288.

† Nelson's Life of Bp. Bull, p. 264.

will appear that they speak of a nativity not real, but figurative; that is, their meaning was that the Logos, or Divine Word, which from all Eternity did exist in and with God the Father, as the co-eternal offspring of His Eternal mind, then, when He was about to create the World, came forth unto operation (κατ' ἐνέργειαν), and so proceeded to the constitution and formation of all things therein, for the *manifesting* Himself and His Father to the Creatures, and that by reason of this progression (προέλευσις), He is in Scripture called the Son of God, and His First-begotten.

"This Bishop Bull clears up * by a most accurate explication of the opinions of *Athenagoras*, concerning the Son's eternity and progression, as also of *Tatian* and *Theophilus Antiochenus*, whom he proveth as to the main to have been sound and Catholic in this point. The same he hath made out also concerning *St. Hippolytus*, and hath fully represented the sentiment hereupon of *Tertullian* . . . He shows by several plain and express testimonies of *Justin Martyr*, &c. &c., that the better and greater part of the Christian doctors, who lived before the Council of Nice, did openly, clearly, and perspicuously teach the Son's *co-eternal* existence with God the Father †."

Such was the judgment of Bishop Bull concerning the orthodoxy of those identical *Six Fathers*, in that

* P. 266. † Pp. 264. 266.

very article of Faith, concerning which the Essayist suborns Waterland, against his will and express testimony, to accuse them of heresy!

But the cause of the Ante-Nicene Church is not yet decided. The Essayist denies that it has been shown by Bishop Bull that the doctrine of the Trinity * was held by it: he doubts also whether it believed in Original Sin; and whether Infant Baptism was the rule of the Church for the first four centuries; and his argument is, that if these great doctrines, which almost all men profess, remained so long *undeveloped*, it is no refutation of the *Romish* doctrines †, of Purgatory, Saint-worship ‡, Transubstantiation, Communion in one kind, Image-worship, the Pope's Infallibility, &c.,—to show that these tenets were unknown to the Church in primitive ages.

It is necessary, therefore, for us to examine the premises of his Syllogism. *Did* the Catholic doc-

* Pp. 11—17. † P. 20.

‡ Of which Cardinal Bellarmine says very candidly, "Non tam lege aliquâ quàm *consuetudine* Sancti *cœperunt* coli." Bellarm. de Sanctorum Beat. i. cap. 8. Leo III., about A.D. 800, was the first Pope who canonized any Saint. Ibid. Transubstantiation was not made an Article of Faith in the Church of Rome till the Fourth Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215, (Scotus ap. Bellar. de Eucharistia, III. c. 23,) and was not even then formally defined. And for twelve hundred years after Christ the cup was given to the laity. Lindan, Panopl. iv. 2. And Polydore Vergil confesses that the Fathers condemned the worship of images. De Invent. vi. 13. The doctrine of the Pope's Infallibility, as is well known, was rejected by the Councils of Constance and Basle, and by the Gallican Church in its Articles of 1682.

trines of which he speaks remain so long undiscovered?

First, Infant Baptism. This the Church of England practises, "because," as she declares in her twenty-seventh Article, "it is most agreeable *with the Institution of Christ.*" If agreeable with His Institution, it must have been observed in primitive times. And how is it proved to be agreeable to it? By Scripture. Let me observe, I shall not here appeal to *our* Divines, but to *yours*. *Formerly* they allowed this: but your later doctors differ widely from your earlier in this respect. *Now* you ground Infant Baptism on the authority either of oral Tradition or of the present Church. The doctrine is no longer visible in Scripture! But I am speaking of your *elder* Theologians. Bellarmine says *, "This doctrine is proved by three kinds of arguments, of which the first is *Scripture.*" The same is asserted by Gregory of Valentia †, and by Suarez ‡, who teaches that "many arguments can be produced from *Scripture* to establish Infant Baptism;" and even your "living Infallible Judge §," in a decretal on *Infant Baptism*, inserted in the Canon Law, declares very well that "as the Mosaic ‖ Law pro-

* De Bapt. lib. i. c. 8.

† De Bapt. Parvul. § 2, 1.

‡ In Thom. p. 3, disput. 25, sect. i. § 2.

§ Pope Innocent III. Decretal. lib. iii. tit. xlii. cap. 3, vol. ii. p. 620. "Sacramentum baptismi utiliter confertur *parvulis*," &c.

‖ Gen. xvii. 14.

nounced without exception that the uncircumcised man child whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people," so now the voice of the Gospel declares indiscriminately to all, that "unless a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

Such once was the teaching of Rome: but somehow or other the Bible in her hand is like an ancient inscription, of which the characters become obscure by time. Or we may say that she makes the Sacred Volume into a Palimpsest, by writing her own traditions over the divine Text: and, in order that her own word may be read, she renders that of God illegible even to herself *. So it has happened with Infant Baptism, as I have shown. It was formerly *proved* from Scripture by a Cardinal and a Pope; but *now* it cannot be decyphered there! Thus (for instance) your Roman Doctor Perrone † writes, "There are some articles of faith of which *nothing* is read in *Scripture*, or can be proved from it; for example, the canonicity and inspiration of the Bible, the *Baptism* of *Infants*, concerning which nothing is said in Scripture, or can be demonstrated from it."

Where then, my dear Sir, is the boasted *unity* of

* Mark vii. 9. ἀθετεῖτε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἵνα τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν τηρήσητε.

† Perrone, Prælectiones, vol. ii. p. 1216. "De quibus nihil in Scripturis nec ex eis probari valet."

teaching in the Church of Rome, if she says that what had been proved by her from Scripture in one age cannot be found there in another? If her *own* ancient doctors were to arise from the dead, would not even *they* charge her with blindness? would not even they say that the dreadful curse which overtook the Jews has also fallen on her, that the veil is on her heart in reading the word of God *?

But I return to the question, "Is Infant Baptism a 'Development?'" or was it a primitive practice of the Church?

The Fathers of the early Church uniformly interpreted the words of our Lord, "Except a man be born again (or, more precisely, whosoever is not born, ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῇ) of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God,"—of baptism by water †. By consequence they affirmed that since infants have souls to be saved, they ought to be baptized *without delay* ‡. And the analogy of Cir-

* 2 Cor. iii. 14.

† Hooker, V. lix. 2. "The general current of Antiquity agrees in the *literal* interpretation."

‡ The Synodical Epistle of the third Council of Carthage, held under Cyprian, to Fidus, is very clear on this point. "As to what concerns the cause of infants, who you say ought not to be baptized within the second or third day after their birth, and that the law of circumcision was to be considered, which led you to think that no one should be baptized before the eighth day after his birth, this Synod was of a very different opinion. *Not one* of us agreed that what you recommended should be done, but we decided *unanimously* that the grace of God should be denied to no one. For since the Lord says (Luke ix. 56), 'The Son of Man has come not to destroy

cumcision which was to be administered to Jewish infants confirmed them in this belief. Hence St. Augustine says in one of his sermons *, "It is *an ancient Rule* of Faith that Infants should be baptized, for they are infected by original sin." And again, in another sermon †, "Let no one corrupt you with heterodox notions. The Church has *always* held and retained ‡ this practice of baptizing Infants: it has received it from the faith of its Fathers." And Augustine testifies, that when the Pelagians were pressed with arguments deduced from the practice of Infant Baptism, which refuted their objections to the Doctrine of Original Sin, they would have maintained that Infants were not to be baptized, had it not been for the text of St. John, iii. 5 §; and it is no less certain that they would have alleged that the early Church did not baptize Infants, if Infant Baptism had been a "Development."

Let us pause for a moment here to lift up our hearts in gratitude to God's overruling Providence

men's lives but to save them,' as far as in us lies, if possible, no soul is to be lost. All, whether men or infants, as Scripture teaches, may be equally recipients of Divine saving grace." This Council was held A.D. 253, and was composed of sixty-six Bishops. Compare Routh, Reliquiæ, ii. 74—77. 118. 142. 459. 467.

* Sermon VIII. de Verb. Apost. c. 8.

† Serm. X. de Verb. Apost. c. 2.

‡ "Semper habuit, semper tenuit . . . hoc a majorum fide accepit."

§ De Peccatorum Meritis, i. c. 30.

in making heresies serve the cause of truth, by elucidating and confirming the doctrines and practices of the Church. Even Pelagius, we see, comes to our aid in support of Infant Baptism. But the Essayist, instead of giving due weight to these clear testimonies in its behalf, would unsettle the whole matter by citing some particular cases of eminent persons who were not baptized in their Infancy. Such is his inordinate love of uncertainty that he will accept *no Rule*, if by dint of hard labour he can find or make an *exception*. In the same way as he affirmed that the Canon of the New Testament was not fixed till the end of the fourth century, because one or two private Churches or individuals entertained some doubts concerning the Canonicity of one or two of the least books in it, so now, because he can discover that some few persons in early times, who were *afterwards celebrated* in the world, were not baptized in their Infancy, therefore Infant Baptism was not the practice of the Church.

"Infant Baptism," says he *, "which is happily a fundamental rule with us, was *less* clearly appreciated in the early Church . . . . Even in the fourth century St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Basil, and St. Augustine, with Christian mothers, were not baptized till they were adults † . . . . Evidently then

* P. 410.

† P. 411. The following are the words of the Essayist on these cases. "St. Gregory's mother dedicated him to God imme-

the position of Baptism in the received system was not the same in the first ages as in later times; and still less clearly was it ascertained in the first three centuries."

Permit me to say a few words concerning these three cases. In the first place, let us remember that the greatness of the names of these persons does not in any way affect the question. The authority of Augustine, the Bishop and Doctor of the Church,

diately on his birth; and again when he had come to years of discretion, with the rite of taking the sacred books into his hands by way of consecration. He was religiously-minded from his youth, and had devoted himself to a single life. Yet his baptism did not take place till after he had attended the schools of Cæsarea, Palestine, and Alexandria, and was on his voyage to Athens. He had embarked during the November gales, and for twenty days his life was in danger. He presented himself for baptism as soon as he got to land. St. Basil was the son of Christian confessors on both father's and mother's side. His grandmother Macrina, who brought him up, had for seven years lived with her husband in the woods of Pontus during the Decian persecution. His father was said to have wrought miracles; his mother, an orphan of great personal beauty, was forced from her unprotected state to abandon the hope of a single life, and was conspicuous in matrimony for her care of strangers and the poor, and for her offerings to the Churches. How religiously she brought up her children is shown by the singular blessing, that four out of ten have since been canonized as Saints. St. Basil was one of these; yet the child of such parents was not baptized till he had come to man's estate,—till, according to the Benedictine Editor, his twenty-first, and perhaps his twenty-ninth, year. St. Augustine's mother, who is herself a Saint, was a Christian when he was born, though his father was not. Immediately on his birth, he was made a catechumen; in his childhood he fell ill, and asked for baptism. His mother was alarmed, and was taking measures for his reception into the Church, when he suddenly got better, and it was *deferred*. He did not receive baptism till the age of thirty-three, after he had for nine years been a victim of Manichæan error."

cannot by any proleptical device be made to sanction or excuse any treatment Augustine received or did not receive when he was an infant in his cradle. The candid inquirer will examine not what these venerable Fathers suffered as children, but what they *taught* and practised as *men;* and he will say that—whatever happened to them as *infants*—as *saints* they were baptized, in *will*, if not in *deed*, even from their mother's womb, *if*, as Doctors of the Church, they taught that *Infants ought to be baptized.*

It is quite true that Gregory Nazianzen was not baptized in his infancy; and if he was born, as some have thought, before his father was a Christian, this is not to be wondered at. But, however this may be, we find in his works an Oration concerning Baptism*, in which he vehemently *censures* those who *delay* their own or their children's baptism. "Art thou a youth? (he exclaims) fight against the world with this baptismal weapon: hast thou a child? let it be sanctified from its *infancy*, and dedicated from its cradle to God." He reproves those who would put off their baptism till a particular season (however holy) of the year, as Epiphany, Easter, Whit Sunday†, or who would wait to be baptized by a Bishop, instead of an ordinary Priest. He also refers to the administration of Circumcision to infants eight days old in the Jewish Church as an argument for *Infant Baptism* in the Christian.

* Oratio XL. § 11, 12, § 17. † Ibid. 24.

To say now a few words of Basil. His friend, Gregory Nazianzen, preached a sermon concerning him some time after his death, and gave in it a short narrative of his life. He there says*, that Basil was formed by his father, who was a priest of Pontus, "with that best and holiest spiritual formation which David rightly names of the *day*, as opposed to the *natural* creation, which is of the *night*." Now, Gregory, in his sermon on Baptism†, calls that Sacrament the *day-birth* (*γέννησις ἡμερινὴ*), as being the day-spring of our *spiritual* life as children of Light. Hence it is inferred, with a very good show of reason‡, that Basil *was* baptized in his infancy; and there is no evidence to show that he was *not*. So much for the second example.

Now for the third—St. Augustine. It is certain that his father, Patricius, was a *heathen* when Augustine was born§; and how morosely his father thwarted his mother, and how beautifully Monica bore his waywardness, is known to all readers of the Confessions‖. No sooner was his father converted, than the son, now in the flower of his age, began to

* Ed. Bened. XLIII. § 12.

† § 2. See Wall on Infant Baptism, i. p. 165, ed. Cotton, Oxford, 1836.

‡ Wall, ii. p. 72.

§ "Ille nondum crediderat," says Augustine of his father's condition at the time he himself was nine years old. Confess. I. c. ix. Patricius only began to be a catechumen when Augustine was sixteen. Ibid. ii. c. iii. Ille adhuc catechumenus, et hoc recens erat.

‖ See especially IX. c. ix.

follow evil courses: both his parents now joined together in urging him to be baptized *; but first he became a Manichæan, then a Sceptic, till, at length, by the grace of God blessing his mother's prayers, he became a Catechumen, and was baptized at Milan by St. Ambrose, in his thirty-third year, A.D. 387.

Thus far concerning his personal history. We have already seen† what he *taught* concerning Infant Baptism. He affirms‡ that "he never met with any Christian, orthodox or heretical, who taught any other doctrine than that infants were to be baptized;" and yet the Essayist would lead us to believe that his own parents were Antipædobaptists? I will only observe further concerning him, that he was one of the Sixty African Bishops who formed the Council of Milevis, in the year A.D. 416, and that he affixed his name to its Decrees, of which the following is one §:—"Whosoever affirms that new-born children (recentes ab utero matris) ought not to be baptized—let him be anathema."

As I have before said, some of the most powerful arguments for Infant Baptism are derived from those heretics who magnified human will, to the disparage-

* Confess. V. xiv. Statui esse catechumenus in catholicâ Ecclesiâ mihi a parentibus commendatâ. And VI. c. xi. Figam pedes in eo gradu in quo *puer* a *parentibus* positus eram.

† See above, p. 208. ‡ De Nat. et Grat. c. 59.

§ Canon ii. Labbe, Concilia, t. ii. p. 1537.

ment of Divine Grace—the Pelagians. Pelagius himself thus wrote*:—"Some persons slanderously affirm that I deny the Sacrament of Baptism to Infants, or promise the kingdom of heaven to any without the atonement of Christ,—propositions which I never so much as *heard* even from the lips of heretics. For who can be so impious as to prevent infants from being baptized and born again in Christ, when our Lord Himself says that 'no one can enter into the kingdom of heaven, except he be born of water and the Spirit?'" Again, Cœlestine, a scholar of Pelagius, says†, "We confess that Infants ought to be baptized according to the Rule of the Universal Church and the precepts of the Gospel." Now, my dear Sir, this is the language even of heretics, whose error was confuted by the *practice* of the Church in administering baptism to Infants. Judge, then, of the honour which the Church of Rome has gained herself by admitting into her communion one who affirms, on the strength of those solitary exceptions, which are of no value even in themselves, and much less against all this weight of testimony and teaching—that "Infant Baptism is a Development," and that it was "less clearly appreciated by the early Church" than it is now‡. And this is the kind of theology which Roman di-

* See Aug. de Pecc. Orig. c. xvii. xviii.

† Aug. de Pecc. Orig. c. v. ‡ Newman's Essay, p. 410.

vines declare to be "in full accordance with Catholic Truth*!"

If we *must compare* one age of the Church with another, we must confess, to our own shame and woe, that the inestimable blessings of Infant Baptism are "*less* appreciated" in *modern* than they were in *ancient* times; and this unhappy degeneracy is mainly attributable to the attempts of modern Romish Divines making common cause with Anabaptists, first, endeavouring to persuade the world that Infant Baptism cannot be proved from Scripture, but rests on Tradition; and, when they have done this, proceeding further in the work of demolition, and labouring to show that Tradition itself is very doubtful in this matter, and that Infant Baptism is a "Development" of comparatively recent times; so that, in the end, having unsettled the foundations of Scripture and Antiquity, they would fain have us to think that Infant Baptism depends only on the authority of the existing Church of Rome; and that no one acts consistently in bringing young children to Christ to be baptized, unless he acknowledges the supremacy of the Pope! Thus they would undermine the Christian *Sacraments*, as well as the *Scriptures*, to build the Romish See on their ruins!

Pardon me a short digression, which will show that the Essayist's assertions concerning Baptism are but too much in accordance with Romish practices,

* See above, Letter I. p. 13.

and I will close this letter. In the year 1568, Nov. 21, a person named Thomas Heth * preached a sermon at the Cathedral Church of our English city of Rochester. After he had left the pulpit, a letter, directed to him (as was afterwards discovered) under a false name, and signed by Samuel Malt, a Spanish Jesuit, was found there by the sexton, Richard Fisher. The letter excited some suspicion against the aforesaid Thomas Heth as a treasonable person, and the Dean of Rochester sent to the Queen's Arms in that city, where Heth lodged, and on examination, the persons sent by the Dean found in one of Heth's boots certain papers, one being a licence from the Fraternity of Jesuits, another, a Bull of Pope Pius the Fifth, authorizing him to preach any doctrine the Jesuits might direct, for sowing divisions among the English. In his portmanteau were various *Books against Infant Baptism.* In the letter which fell down in the pulpit, and which was dated from Madrid, it was communicated as a piece of intelligence, that certain persons familiar to Heth, viz. "Hallingham, Coleman, and Benson, had set up a faction among the German Heretics; so that several who have turned from us, have now denied their baptism, which we hope will soon turn the scale, and bring them back to their old principles."

* See Robert Ware's Foxes and Firebrands; or a Specimen of the Danger and Harmony of Popery and Separation. London, 1682, pp. 31—47.

It is very remarkable that these identical persons, "Hallingham, Coleman, and Benson," are mentioned by our Church Historians*, as being accounted the chief leaders of the *Puritans* of the time!

Let me mention another fact.

In the year 1646, above a hundred *Romish Priests* were sent into England to personate *Independents, Anabaptists,* and *Presbyterians,* to foment *divisions* in the Church of England, and *then* to *taunt her with them.* Many of these joined the Parliament's army, and corresponded with other Romanists who were in the King's, and both parties communicated with their respective fraternities abroad, and they with Rome: and when some of the Romish Friars, who pretended to be Puritans, wrote to the Sorbonne at Paris to inquire whether it was lawful to put the King and his son to death, the reply was, that it was lawful to overthrow the Government for the good of the Church (of Rome), and to kill the King for the same purpose.

These facts, and more of the same kind, are recorded in a letter to Archbishop Usher, from Archbishop Bramhall, who says, "I would hardly have

* Fuller, ix. § 9. Camden, Annal. ad ann. 1568. Heylyn, History of Presbyter. book vi. See Bp. Stillingfleet on Separation, Preface; and Wall on Infant Baptism, ii. p. 372. Compare the note in the late Dr. Wordsworth's Eccles. Biography, iv. 64, on Bp. Jewell's expression, "Popish Priests in the masquerade of Puritan Preachers."

credited these things, *had not mine eyes seen sure evidence of the same* *."

Such is the policy of Rome! Pardon me, if I speak strongly, but on reviewing what I have written, I cannot forbear saying, that if the Church of Rome can but strengthen her own See, she will spare neither friend nor foe, she will not scruple to sacrifice Sense, Scripture, Sacraments, Synods, Saints, and Sovereigns to her own insatiable selfishness.

I am, Sir,
&c. &c.

* Works, i. p. xcvii. ed. Oxford, 1842.

LETTER IX.

"Revertar ad principalitatem veritatis et posteritatem mendacitatis deputandam ; . . ex ipso ordine manifestatur id esse Dominicum et verum quod sit prius traditum, id autem extraneum et falsum quod sit posterius immissum."—TERTULL. Præscr. Hær. 31.

"Hence it is visible wherein the strength of his performance lies, and what it is that he chiefly trusts to . . . It is not *Scripture*, it is not *Antiquity*, but a Philosophical Principle, to which *Scripture, Fathers, everything*, must yield—which appears at length to be of that kind of Vain Philosophy which is often intruding itself where it has nothing to do."—WATERLAND'S Works, i. p. 2. p. 232, ed. Van Mildert.

MY DEAR SIR,

The transition is easy from Infant Baptism to Original Sin. The Essayist would have us believe, that the doctrine of Original Sin was not developed before that of Purgatory. The dictum of Vincentius, says he, (quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus, id verum,) "admits both, or excludes both *;" that is, you cannot find any testimony for the one which may not be balanced by an equal amount of testimony for the other †.

* P. 17, compare p. 83.

† In very similar language the *Dublin Review* (June, 1845, p. 361,)

This is a very alarming assertion, if true. It would require us to recast our whole System of Theology. If the doctrine of "Original Sin can allege little definite testimony *," as he asserts, "before the fifth century," if it rests on no surer ground than that of Purgatory, then our whole religious fabric is built upon the sand.

To show this more clearly, let us inquire into the *date* of the doctrine of Purgatory. Your own divines have settled that point for us. A Romish Bishop and Cardinal,—one of our own country,—Bishop Fisher, of Rochester, informs us that this doctrine had only just been discovered in his day, and that it had not yet been found out by the Greek Church. His words are remarkable, and afford another proof that the doctrine of *Development* was not unknown to Romish Divines three hundred years ago.

"No orthodox person," says he, "has any doubt of the existence of Purgatory; and yet no mention of it, or scarcely any, was made by the ancients, and it is not believed by the Greeks up to this day: as long as no one thought about Purgatory, so long no one applied for Indulgences; for all the value of Indul-

says, "For every *ancient* authority which Anglicans can produce in favour of the *consubstantiality of the Holy Ghost*, we offer to produce as unequivocal an authority in behalf of Purgatory; and for every *prayer* to the Holy Ghost we offer to produce as direct an invocation to a Saint. But we shall *not* suffer 'Roman' doctrine to be rejected on grounds which would be equally subversive of Trinitarian Doctrine."

* P. 17.

gences depends on Purgatory. Take away Purgatory, and what is the use of Indulgences? Indulgences, therefore, came into vogue when men had trembled for some time at the thought of the pains of Purgatory *."

Prierius † says plainly, "Indulgences were not made known to us by *Scripture*, but by the Roman Church, which is *greater* than Scripture:"—but to return to Polydore Vergil. His Book is entitled De Rerum *Inventoribus*, and such is his account of the first invention of Purgatory. It was discovered about the same time as America, and Indulgences are a kind of Polynesia, hanging on to the great Purgatorian continent.

You see, then, to what a low date the doctrine of Original Sin must be brought, if its development is to be made contemporary with that of Purgatory, especially too, if the Greeks are to be regarded as

* Joannes Roffensis Episcopus (i. e. Fisher, Bishop of Rochester), contra Lutherum, Art. XVIII., and apud Polydorum Vergilium, viii. 1, who was a native of Urbino, Nuncio of the Pope, Sub-collector of Peter's Pence in England, Prebendary of St. Paul's, and Archdeacon of Wells, in the reign of Henry the Seventh. See Tanner's Bibl. Brit. p. 737. It is worthy of remark, that the Roman Catholic Editors of Polydore Vergil at Cologne, 1626, have expunged this passage, which will be found in the Leyden edition of 1644, p. 526, as well as in those in Basle. The loci corrigendi are noted in the Index Expurgatorius, p. 194, ed. 1599. One of the *Corrigenda* is "Nullius animalis effigiem colito."

† Silvest. Prier. contra Luther. 56. "Indulgentiæ non innotuere nobis authoritate Scripturæ sed authoritate Ecclesiæ Romanæ, *quæ major est.*

any part of the Christian Church; for with them it had not been developed in the sixteenth century, when Polydore wrote, nor has it to this day.

But this is not all. If your doctors are to be trusted, the doctrine of Original Sin is not yet discovered. You have no good chart of it, even in the nineteenth century; mists and clouds hang over it. It awaits an Argonaut from Rome. Your Roman theologians have never yet settled the question, whether *all* men are conceived and born in sin: but (notwithstanding their perfect unity) are *divided* on this point. You remember that it was debated with great warmth at the Council of Trent, between the Franciscans and Dominicans *, whether the Blessed Virgin Mary was free from that "fault and corruption of *every man* that is naturally engendered of the offspring of Adam †;" and though that Council, as you affirm, was divinely inspired, and though you have an infallible living Judge, and though the great use of Infallibility (one would think) is *to settle litigated questions*, yet the inspired Council and the infallible Judge have permitted the matter to remain unsettled even to this day ‡.

* See Sarpi's History on the year 1546, pp. 164—171, in Brent's Version, and p. 186 of the Italian original, ed. 1629.

† XXXIX Articles. Art. IX. See also Art. XV.

‡ This is allowed by the Dublin Reviewer for Jan. 1847, p. 331. "It is well known that St. Thomas (Aquinas) did not hold the immaculate Conception, which is a pretty plain proof that it was not a commonly received doctrine in any age before his time. . . . *Up to this* time it has not been *definitively decided* by the Church that our

The struggle at Trent concerning this doctrine was a very significant exposure of the inward conflict by which Rome was even then torn between Tradition and Development. Girolamo Lombardello, one of the Franciscans who contended against the Dominicans for the original sinlessness of the Virgin, asserted that * "the authority of the *present* Church was not less than that of the *primitive;* and if the consent of the ancient Church led men to speak of Original Sin without any exception in favour of the Virgin †, the consent of the *present* Church, which proves itself by its *practice* in celebrating every where a Festival in honour of her Immaculate Conception, ought to induce us not to abandon it."

The expedient resorted to by the Council to reconcile the two parties, would be an amusing exhibition of ingenious sleight-of-hand, if the matter on which

Lady was without original sin, although there are several devotions sanctioned by the Holy See (which have indulgences attached to them) in which it is stated most explicitly." Here is another example of the adoption of the principle of Development by Romish writers, and a plain avowal that, in their opinion, the Church of Rome (i. e. the Pope) may *make* articles, *de fide*, in the nineteenth century, which have never been believed in any of the eighteen preceding ones.

* Sarpi Istoria, p. 188, Italian edition, 1629.

† Yes; and not only so, but it expressly taught that the Virgin *ought not* to be excepted. Thus S. Augustine, in Psalm xxxiv. Maria ex Adam mortua propter peccatum; and contra Julian. Pelagian. c. v. 15. Mariæ corpus ex concupiscentiâ venit; and Opus Imperf. contra Julian. vi. 22. Maria de carnali parentum concupiscentiâ nata. The assertion that the Virgin was sinless is due to a heretic, *Pelagius*, apud Aug. de Naturâ et Gratiâ, c. 36.

this juggler's trick was played were not of the most solemn importance.

The Synod, desiring to satisfy both sides, at first purposed to decree, that it did not either include or except the Virgin; that is, it wished to say—that it could say nothing. But this did not suit the Franciscans: so it said that it did not intend to include the Virgin; and it added, that the Constitution of Sixtus IV., who condemned all those who took upon them to assert that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is heretical, when the *question had not yet been decided* by the *Roman Church* *, should be observed. So instead of saying either yea or nay, it ended with saying neither one nor the other †.

But to return. We of the Church of England, following the early Church ‡, affirm that the doctrine of Original Sin, unqualified by any exceptions, has

* Bull, Grave nimis, A.D. 1483, in Jus Canon. Extrav. Comm. iii. tit. xii. cap. 2. "Quum *nondum* sit a Romanâ Ecclesiâ et apostolicâ sede *decisum*."

† The following is the Decree (Sess. v. de peccato originali):—"Declarat hæc sancta synodus non esse suæ intentionis comprehendere in hoc decreto, ubi de peccato originali agitur, beatam et immaculatam Virginem Mariam, Dei genetricem, *sed* observandas esse constitutiones felicis recordationis Xysti Papæ Quarti, sub pœnis in eis constitutionibus contentis."

‡ e. g. Concil. Carthag. sub Cypriano, A.D. 253. "Infans recens natus . . carnaliter natus contagium mortis antiqua prima nativitate contraxit." Routh, R. S. iii. pp. 76. 121; whose note affords a complete refutation to the assertion, that "the doctrine of original sin can allege little definite testimony before the fifth century."

been developed for more than three thousand years. We find it in Holy Scripture. "The Scripture hath concluded *all* under sin*." "There is none righteous, no, *not one*." "In many things we offend *all*." Adam lost his purity by sin. We all come from Adam. "And who can bring a clean thing from an unclean? Not one," said Job†, fifteen hundred years before the birth of Christ. We all sinned in Adam: and by nature we are all tainted and in a state of death through his sin‡; this is the doctrine of the Apostles of Christ.

The mystery of Christ's Incarnation through the operation of the Holy Spirit, the Author of all Purity, is a proof of the corruption of human nature. It was necessary that the Son of God should take our nature upon Him in order to *suffer* for it, therefore He was born of a woman; but it was necessary also that He should be exempt from the *sinfulness* of our nature, in order to *satisfy* for it: therefore, as man, He was not begotten by man, but "the Holy Thing which was conceived" in the womb§ of the Virgin, and born of her, was of the Holy Ghost‖; was

* Gal. iii. 22. Rom. iii. 9. James iii. 2. † Job xiv. 4.

‡ Rom. v. 12. 1 Cor. xv. 22. Eph. ii. 3.

§ Matt. i. 20. Luke i. 35.

‖ "Maria quidem mater Ejus," (says Augustine, Opus Imperf. c. Julian. vi. 22,) "de quâ carnem sumpsit, de carnali concupiscentiâ parentum nata est; non autem Christum sic ipsa concepit, quem non de virili semine sed de Spiritu Sancto procreavit." The assertion of the Virgin's sinlessness would undermine the doctrine that Christ was conceived of the Holy Ghost.

the Son of God. But *if* it were *possible* that a man born of a woman in the ordinary course of nature could be free from sin, then there was no *dignus vindice nodus* for the intervention of the Holy Ghost.

Nor was it in any way due to the Blessed Virgin, that Christ was free from sin in His *human* nature ; "when He took upon Him to deliver man, He did *not abhor* the Virgin's Womb," but the Holy Ghost was the cause, the only cause, that as man He was sinless.

Again : the rite of Purification * after Child-birth among the Jews, and with us the institution of the Sacrament of Baptism to be administered "to *all* nations," and the Baptism of Infants by the Church from the earliest times, are practical proofs of the primitive belief of this doctrine. "Infants are baptized (says Origen †) for the remission of sin. Of what sin? or when did they sin? How can infant Baptism be maintained except on the principle that no one is free from corruption *though he be only a day old?* Because the taint of our birth is purified by the Sacrament of Baptism, therefore," says he, "infants are baptized."

* Levit. xii. 1—8. See S. August. iii. 793, in Levit. xii. "Hic ostenditur illa propago ex Adam, unde Apostolus dicit, *Ex uno in condemnationem*, et quia *per unum hominem peccatum introivit in mundum, et per peccatum mors, et ita in omnes homines pertransiit.*" Rom. v. 16. 12.

† In Levit. Hom. viii. 3.

But, now my dear Sir, let us revert for a moment to the doctrine of Purgatory. *That* is found in neither of the Testaments, New or Old. One of your Bishops and Cardinals tells us, as we have seen, that it had only been recently developed in his age, the fifteenth century; that is, as long *after* Christ, as Job was *before* Him. And yet we are told that we must either admit both these doctrines or reject both: and the book, which contains this assertion, is eulogized by a Romanist Authority as the work of one who "has embraced the Catholic System with the fervour and simplicity of one trained from infancy to the Faith * !"

But other causes for greater wonder and sorrow still remain behind.

You remember the speech of Lælius in the first book of Lucan's Pharsalia †, when Cæsar, at the head of his legions, having just crossed the Rubicon, had resolved to contend for the empire of the world, whatever bloodshed might be the consequence. Lælius, one of his centurions, addressed him in the name of his soldiers as follows:—

> "Si licet," exclamat, "Romani maxime Rector
> Nominis, et jus est veras expromere voces,
> Quod tam lenta tuas tenuit patientia vires,
> Conquerimur; deeratne tibi fiducia nostri?
> Dum movet hæc calidus spirantia corpora sanguis,
> Jussa sequi tam posse mihi quam velle necesse est.

---

* See above, Letter I. p. 12.

† i. 359.

Non civis meus est, in quem tua classica, Cæsar,
Audiero. Per signa decem felicia castris
Perque tuos juro quocunque ex hoste triumphos,
Pectore si fratris gladium, juguloque parentis
Condere me jubeas, plenæque in viscera partu
Conjugis, invitâ peragam tamen omnia dextrâ.
Si spoliare Deos, ignemque immittere templis,
Tu, quoscunque voles in planum effundere muros,
His aries actus disperget saxa lacertis.

Which may be thus englished :—

If, mightiest ruler of the Roman world,
Our tongues may speak the truth, we bear it ill
That thou so patient art. Dost thou distrust us ?
While the warm blood flows in these living limbs,
My power and will must be to follow thee.
He, against whom thy trumpet sounds, shall be
No countryman of mine. By ten campaigns,
Cæsar, by all thy triumphs do I swear,
If in my brother's breast, or father's throat,
Or womb of pregnant wife, to plunge my sword
Thou biddest me, what thou dost bid I'll do.
If to despoil the gods, and fire their temples,—
I'll do it ; what city walls thou wouldst lay flat
Upon the ground, these arms of mine shall dash
The battering-ram, and scatter all their stones.

These lines, my dear Sir, often occur to me when I consider the Religion and Policy of Rome, especially as it is exhibiting itself at the present day. The modern "Ruler of the Roman World" has now legions of Lælii, whose only law is to follow him at any cost, and whose language is,—

Jussa sequi tàm *posse* mihi quàm *velle necesse est.*

Obedience to him is with them a kind of *fatalism.* Nothing so dear that they will not injure ; nothing

so sacred that they will not assail, if he bids them. Father, Mother, Sisters, Brothers, Wife, Children, —and *that* which, as Cicero* well says, "omnes omnium caritates complexa est," their Country—are not only to be given up, but destroyed, if the Pope orders it. You, alas! in France have bitter cause to lament this. France is even now a victim to the blind allegiance of her Clergy to the Pope. The oath which they take to him is like that of Lælius to Cæsar; it obliges them to see their country bleed, nay, to *make* it bleed for his sake. You, like Cæsar's legions, have crossed the Rubicon; a civil war is almost raging among you; and if your State does not become more religious, and your Church more patriotic, you soon may have a Pharsalia.

The danger of a conflict between Spiritual and Secular antichristianism,—that is, between unbelieving Policy on the one side, and corrupt Religion on the other,—is one which does not threaten you alone, but seems more or less imminent in all the countries of Europe at the present day; and it is fearful to think of the results of the triumph of either of these two parties. May it please the Almighty Ruler of the universe so to guide the hearts of your Statesmen, and to govern the wills of your Clergy, and of those in other countries, that the world may be spared the

* De Officiis, i. 17. Cari sunt parentes, cari liberi, propinqui, familiares, sed omnes omnium caritates *patria* una complexa est, pro quâ quis bonus dubitet mortem oppetere?

fearful conflict which seems almost ready to rend it asunder!

But I was now speaking more particularly of the destruction of things *sacred*, which follows the progress of Rome. As I have already shown, we are called upon to demolish every thing, however holy, at the Pope's bidding; and he rejoices in proving his power by annihilating all other authority. Like Abimelech, he would destroy all his brethren, that he may reign alone. Not only if he orders us to attempt to despoil the Divine Being of His attributes, and to vilify His Word, and to desecrate His worship, must we obey, but he exults in this work of spoliation.

In proof of this, be it remembered that the Church of Rome has welcomed to her arms a writer who would unsettle the Canon of Scripture, who questions the primitive character of Infant Baptism, who would induce us to brand the Ante-Nicene Fathers as teachers of heresy, who would persuade us that the doctrine of Original Sin is a novelty; let it, I say, not be forgotten, that the book containing these propositions has *not* been put by the Church of Rome into the Index Expurgatorius, but has been lauded and lectured on by Romish Bishops, and that its Author has been caressed by Romish Prelates, Cardinals, and Popes, lavishing their favours on one who, as if he had not done enough to unsettle the Faith, has even set himself "spoliare Deos ignemque immittere

templis,"—to undermine the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity itself.

"I do not see," says he*, "in what sense it can be said that there is a *consensus* of primitive Divines in favour of the doctrine of the Trinity which will not avail also for certain doctrines of the Roman Church which will presently come into mention," —that is, for Purgatory, the Papal Supremacy, Transubstantiation, the Worship of Saints and Angels and Images.

And in another page (p. 167) he affirms that there was "no formal acknowledgment of the doctrine of the Trinity till the fourth century."

The Author seems to have forgotten the existence of the *Bible* when he thus wrote. Is there not "a *consensus* of primitive Divines" in favour of Holy Scripture? Did not they *all* receive, and read, and expound *it* as the Word of God? Did they not with one voice contend for its supremacy and sufficiency? And were not the Fathers of the Church *reasonable* men? and did they, or could they, by *any* rational process deduce those *other* doctrines of the Roman Church from Scripture? and could they not, and did they not, prove the

* P. 11. Compare the words before cited, pp. 181, 182, of the Dublin Reviewer, June, 1845, p. 352, note. "The remains of Novatian were edited by Jackson, the learned opponent of Waterland: he has added Notes, for the purpose of showing how *all Primitive Antiquity told against the Athanasian doctrine.*" Thus is heresy insinuated in a note!

doctrine of the Trinity from Holy Writ? We affirm and can prove, that with the Scriptures in their hands they *must* have *rejected* the one set of doctrines, *if* they had ever been proposed to them, and *must* have *received*, and *did* receive, the other*.

It is true, indeed, that Romanist Divines† have endeavoured to weaken the *Scriptural* proof of the Doctrine of the Trinity, as others of the same communion, Cardinal Perron, Petavius, and the Dublin Reviewer, have laboured with unhappy zeal to misrepresent the testimony of *Antiquity* on the same subject; and all with the same tendency, if not with the same design, to magnify the Pope, as if he were the Atlas of the Universe, on whose shoulders alone the whole weight of heavenly truth must rest, instead of his being rather like one of the old Titans, who would pull down the firmament, and destroy it if he can.

The Essayist is angry with himself for having once supposed that "Bishop Bull had proved the primitiveness of the Catholic Doctrine of the *Holy*

* See particularly Waterland's proof of the doctrine of the Trinity from *Holy Scripture*, i. 2, pp. 234—238. A Defence of some Queries, Qu. xxii. See also Bp. Butler, Analogy, P. II. ch. 1.

† Dr. Hawarden, for instance, who, in his answer to Clarke and Whiston, 1729, said, p. 7, that "Catholics (Roman Catholics) are so accustomed to join *Faith* and reading the Holy Scripture together, that they account this (*i. e.* the doctrine of the Trinity) to be the *natural* signification of the words," insinuating thereby (as Waterland observes, v. 256) that "the sense which Trinitarians affix to Scripture is *not natural*, but made to appear so, through the prejudice of

Trinity;*" and it appears that he will not *now* be content unless it can be *shown* by particular evidence that *all* the Divines of the primitive Church taught it. "We must," he says, "have a whole doctrine stated by a whole Church†." Alas! for those Fathers whose works are lost, or reduced to a few fragments. If they say nothing concerning the Trinity, they must be regarded as heretics!

But to return for a few moments to Bishop Bull. He certainly *supposed* (and your Bossuet, who appeals to Bull, supposed so likewise, whatever the Essayist may do) that he *had* proved the doctrine of the *Trinity* in his Defence of the Nicene Creed. In his Sermon "on the Catholic Doctrine concerning the blessed *Trinity*," he says‡, "That this is the unanimous consent and constant doctrine of the primitive Fathers, I have fully showed in my *Defensio Fidei Nicænæ;*" and "we know," says Dr. Waterland§, "and you may know, if you please to examine, that, as to the main of our doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, we have the universal Church, as high as any records reach, concurring with us. To

education, or through the lights of an *infallible* chair. Indeed this gentleman afterwards gives very broad intimations that Scripture is not the whole rule of Faith; so now the secret is out, and I suppose it is manifest what cause he is serving, and that he has something more at heart than the doctrine of the Trinity."

* P. 11. † P. 11. ‡ Vol. ii. pp. 2. 6.

§ i. 2. 269. See also Routh, Reliquiæ, ii. 194. 522; iii. 202; and Berriman's Lady Moyer Lectures.

them we appeal, as well as to the Scriptures, that, together with Scripture, we may be the more secure that we follow the right *Interpretations.*"

Thus far, my dear Sir, I had written in this letter, on a Saturday evening; and I am reminded by the following day, Sunday, that the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity is preached not only in sermons by the Christian Fathers, but in almost every religious *observance* which we have inherited from the Primitive Church. The Church cannot stir a step, or exist an hour, without this doctrine. The *first day* of the *week* is holy to God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. It commemorates the work of the Creation of the World by the First, of its Redemption by the Second *, and of its Sanctification by the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity. The Church has proclaimed this doctrine of the Trinity in every baptism that she has ever administered; she has defined it in her Synods, and professed it in her Creeds; she has condemned as heretics all those who have taught any other doctrine; she has ever adored the Triune God in her Eucharistic Trisagion; she has ever ascribed Glory to that Holy Name in her Doxologies, and invoked it in her Apostolic Benedictions; she has pealed it forth in her glorious Hymns, and breathed it in her solemn Liturgies†;

* See Justin Martyr, Apol. i. 66, 67.

† On these several points the English reader will find ample evidence in Waterland, I. pt. ii. pp. 234—249. 251—277. v. pp. 74. 158.

and when she would frame a most sacred Oath *, it was in the Name of the Trinity.

Let, therefore, all the Homilies and Treatises of the Primitive Fathers be destroyed, yet these *practices* of the Church, infinitely more eloquent and persuasive than a thousand sermons, and not confined to a few within a narrow sphere, but observed every where by all, abundantly suffice to prove, what their writings also teach †, that it is nothing short of heresy to assert that "there was no formal acknowledgment of the Holy Trinity till the fourth century," and that there "*is* not a *consensus* of the Primitive Divines in favour of this Doctrine."

But this is not all. The Essayist will not accept the ancient *consensus* of Christendom, in favour of the doctrine of the *Trinity;* but he is ready to impute *Angel-worship* and *Adoration* of *Saints* to the Early Church, on the strength of *one* or *two* isolated expressions in a single Author and a provincial Council, which however, *when examined*, will be found to give no countenance to his allegations.

The first passage to which I refer is from Justin

161. 164. 173. 205. 232—253. viii. p. 134. Bp. Pearson on the Creed, pp. 13. 37. (ed. 1715. Art. i.) Bp. Bull, v. pp. 113. 150—166. 202. vi. 394. Bingham, xiii. cap. 2. Randolph against Lindsay, pp. 53—67. 93—95. 115—117.

* Clem. Rom. ap. Basil. de S. S. 29. Ζῇ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς καὶ τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα.

† See Waterland, v. pp. 158—253. Bull, v. p. 202, seqq.

Martyr's first Apology*; and, as it stands in the text, may be rendered as follows:—

"Him (God) and the Son who came from Him, and who taught us these things, and the host of other good Angels following Him and like Him, and the prophetic Spirit,—we venerate and adore, honouring them with reason and with truth."

"A more express testimony (says the Author) to the *cultus angelorum* cannot be imagined †."

On this passage also he observes, "As to the argument [for the Trinity] derivable from the Doxologies, it must not be forgotten that one of the passages in St. Justin Martyr includes the worship of *Angels*‡." So that these words of Justin are to have a *double* force; *against* the doctrine of the Trinity, and *for* the worship of Angels.

Now granting, for argument's sake, that the above translation, which coincides with that of the Essayist, is a correct representation of Justin's meaning, supposing also that we had no protests against Angel-worship in the writings of the Fathers, and in Councils of the Church; and that the works of the Fathers, or rather of a single Father, are our Rule of Faith, and that Scripture is *not the only* Rule, and that it does not contain commands to worship God alone, and *not* to worship Angels; *then* this passage

* i. 6. † Essay, p. 378. ‡ Essay, p. 16.

might lead us to suppose that the Ante-Nicene Church worshipped Angels, and that we ought to do the same;—but *not otherwise.*

And further, be it observed, that only two MSS. of Justin's Apology are extant, one in France, in the Bibliothèque du Roi, and one in England, in the library of Sir Thomas Phillipps, at Middlehill in Worcestershire, and that both these appear to be copied from the same MS., and they are of no great antiquity; the former was written A.D. 1364; and it is well known that the text of Justin's Apology is in a corrupt state.

Secondly, I do not dwell on the interpretations or corrections of this passage, suggested by Bishop Bull, Dr. Grabe, Dr. Ashton*, Bishop Kaye, and other very learned men; but I would only request you to examine *another* passage in the same Apology, in which the Martyr thus writes:—

"We adore the Creator of the World, . . . and we honour with reason Him Who has taught us these things, and Who was born for this purpose, Jesus Christ, knowing him to be the Son of Very God, and reverencing Him in the *second* place; and in the *third* place the Prophetic Spirit."

Now, *here,* where Justin is enumerating the objects of Christian worship, Angels are in *no place;* they

* His Epistle upon it, attached to his edition, deserves a careful perusal, pp. 295—302, ed. 1768.

are οὔτε λόγου τινὸς ἄξιοι οὔτ' ἀριθματοὶ, whereas, in the other passage, they stand in the *third* place, *between* the Son and the Spirit; and if Justin had intended to say in the former passage that they are objects of worship, assuredly he would not have omitted them altogether in the latter *.

Besides this, in two other passages of his apology, he distinctly affirms that "God *alone* is to be worshipped †," and that, "He alone *is* worshipped by Christians."

If, therefore, our translation of the two first cited passages be correct, we must doubt the soundness of the text of one or the other; and it would be very unfair to Justin, in the mean time, to suppose that, in bearing witness on a matter of *fact* (and not of *opinion*), he is stating an *untruth;* that he is saying that the primitive Church worshipped Angels, which

* Among the various testimonies to prove that neither Angels nor Saints were objects of *cultus* to the earlier Christians, none is clearer than that of Vegetius, ii. 5. "Jurat per Deum, et per Christum, et per Spiritum Sanctum, et per majestatem Imperatoris, quæ secundum Deum (*i. e.* next after God) humano generi *diligenda* est et *colenda*." And Tertullian, Apol. 32. "Juramus per salutem Cæsarum: . . . temperans majestatem Cæsaris infra Deum magis illum commendo Deo, Cui *soli* subjicio:" and, ad Scapulam, 2, "*Colimus* Imperatorem ut hominem a Deo secundum, et solo Deo majorem: sic enim omnibus major est dum solo vero Deo minor est." It would be quite as rational to conclude from *these* passages that the Early Christians worshipped the *Emperors* of *Rome*, as from that of Justin in the text that they worshipped *Angels*.

† Apol. i. c. 20. Θεὸν μόνον δεῖ προσκυνεῖν. Ibid. c. 16. Θεὸν μόνον προσκυνοῦμεν.

from Scripture we know that she *could not*, and from her other Fathers and Councils *, we know she *did not* do; and assuredly it is not reconcileable with Christian charity to him or to her, to make him charge her with Angel-worship, against so much testimony to the contrary. Heaven forbid that we should thus convert the Holy Martyrs of Christ into Witnesses *against* the truth!

I will say but a few words on another passage cited from an ancient Council as a witness to the *adoration of Saints* in the early Church.

"The Canons are extant," says the Essayist †, "of a Council of Illiberis (in Spain), held shortly before the Council of Nicæa, and representative, of course, of the doctrine of the *third century*. Among these occurs the following:—'It is decreed that pictures ought not to be in the Church, lest what is worshipped *or* adored (colitur *aut* adoratur, which marks a *difference* of worship,) be painted on the walls.' . . . This inference seems to follow, that the Spanish Church considered the *Saints* to be in the number of objects either of 'worship or adoration;' for it is of such objects that the representations are forbidden. The very drift of the prohibition is this —*lest* what is in itself an object of worship (*quod*

* Concil. Laod. xxxv. Polycarp, Martyr. ap. Euseb. iv. 15. Theodoret, ad Coloss. cap. ii. Epiphan. Hæres. 60. See also Hooker, ii. p. 62, ed. Keble, and the authors there quoted.

† P. 376.

colitur) should be worshipped *in painting;* unless then Saints and Angels were objects of worship, their pictures would have been allowed."

Here is another specimen of the extraordinary lack of truth and fair reasoning, which, I regret to say,—but which I must not shrink from saying,—is one of the main characteristics of the Essay on Development.

What shadow of proof is there, I ask, that the Council of Illiberis is speaking of pictures of *Saints?* D'Aubespine, your learned Bishop of Orleans, in his notes on this Canon of that Council, says*, "This Canon refers to pictures, *not* of the Holy Martyrs, but of the *Blessed Trinity,* and it forbids any representations of the Deity to be made on the walls . . . lest the majesty of the Divine Being should be impaired. But *this in no way relates to pictures of the Saints.*" Such is the comment of your French Prelate. As for the argument built on the particle *aut,* as if it implied "a *difference* of worship;" and that therefore, if adoration is given to the Supreme Being, there must be some *other* objects of *cultus,* and these objects are Saints; all this reasoning falls in a moment to the ground, when the Canon is *rightly quoted,* as it stands in Labbe†, and in Bruns, where the conjunction is *et,* and not *aut.*

The faith of Rome was "once spoken of through-

* Ap. Labbe, i. p. 998.

† P. 974. Bruns, p. 7, who cites *aut* from one MS. only.

out the whole world *." In course of time the "silver became dross, and the fine gold was changed." Some of her Bishops fell into heresy; Pope Liberius into Arianism, Vigilius into Eutychianism; Honorius was a Monothelite, and was *condemned* as an *archheretic* by *another Pope* †, Leo II., and by his successors; thus, too, Rome stands self-convicted of maintaining falsely a doctrine, which, being false, is the height of impiety—I mean the doctrine of Infallibility; yes, I say, she stands self-convicted of usurping the attribute of God. Boniface III. and his successors in the Papacy have borne the title of Universal Bishop, which Pope Gregory the Great condemned as impious: Pope Gelasius, in the fifth century, condemned communion in one kind as sacrilegious; his successors *enforce* it. And now by the reception of

* Romans i. 8.

† See the very important "Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum, opus diu suppressum, diu desideratum," (Cave, i. 620. It had been printed at Rome in 1660 by Luke Holstein, but was suppressed;) published at Paris, 1680, and by Dr. Routh in his Scriptorum Eccl. Opuscula, p. 507, and the Editor's notes. This "Liber Diurnus" contains the Ordination Oath of the Bishops of Rome in the eighth century. At *that* time the See of Rome had not put forth any claim to infallibility: for, as is said in the text, the *Pope* Honorius was condemned in it as a *heretic;* and there is a plain confession of fallibility, as well as a prophetic denunciation of judgment, in the following remarkable words, p. 507, ed. Routh. "Anathematis interdictioni subjicimus, si quis unquam, seu *nos*, sive est *alius*, qui novum aliquid præsumat contra hujusmodi evangelicam traditionem et orthodoxæ fidei Christianæque religionis integritatem, vel quidquam contrarium annitendo *immutare*, sive subtrahere de integritate fidei nostræ tentaverit, vel ausu sacrilego hoc præsumentibus consentire."

the Author of this Essay on Development with this unhappy book in his hands, and by proclaiming his *conversion* as a signal and glorious *triumph* instead of *censuring* him and his work as promoting *heresy and infidelity*, the Church of Rome has publicly declared to the world, that there is no truth so sacred which may not be assailed in her communion, no error so destructive to Christianity and derogatory to the Divine dignity which may not be professed there, especially if the assault of truth and the profession of error be for the purpose of maintaining the Supremacy of the Pope.

Thus, Sir, we behold the fearful sight of a spirit of Infidelity developing itself in the *Church*, and in that part of the Church which arrogates to itself exclusively the title of the Catholic or Universal Church of Christ.

May I be pardoned by the God of mercy and truth if I speak what is uncharitable or erroneous, but I cannot forbear saying, that in the *sacrilegious* and *destructive* spirit which Rome now evinces, she almost *compels* us to recognize in her that unholy power of which the Apostle foretold that it "will oppose and exalt itself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped: so that as God it will sit in the Temple of God (that is, in the *Church* *), showing itself that it is God †."

* See S. Aug. de Civ. Dei, xx. 19; S. Jerome ad Algasiam, c. xi.
† 2 Thess. ii. 4.

This Power is called by the Apostle ὁ Ἄνομος (v. 8), that is, the *Violator* of all *Law;* a title very characteristic of the Papacy, which, as I have shown, knows no other Law but its own Will, and which of consequence loves to destroy all other Law. The victims of this Power are described by St. Paul, as not receiving the "Love of the Truth," especially of Divine Truth, offered by God for their salvation (εἰς τὸ σωθῆναι αὐτοὺς, v. 10). This, again, is very applicable to the methods which Popery employs, as I have also shown, to discredit the Word of God. The penalty for this rejection of Truth, as St. Paul teaches us, will be the belief of a Lie, or rather of Falsehood (τὸ ψεῦδος), instead of Truth. And what, Sir, can be a fitter punishment for those who treat *God* as *false*, than that they should believe *Man* to be *infallible?* Where the God of Truth is dishonoured, *there*, by way of retribution, awful, but yet just, the Man of Sin will be adored.

When, my dear Sir, we reflect on the working of this Spirit of Infidelity in the Church, and consider that its necessary tendency is to overthrow all earthly Thrones, as it would subvert the heavenly, and to shake all social and domestic Institutions; and when we observe that in the *World* also, as well as in the *Church*, a Spirit of Infidelity is working toward the same ends, although not in the same manner; for the subtlety of the Evil Spirit is marvellously exercised in gaining the same result by

opposite ways; deluding men into the notion that if *one* of these ways is bad, the *other* must be good, because it is *opposite*, whereas they are *both* bad, as *all* the Devil's ways are; when, I say, we perceive that an avowedly Infidel and Revolutionary Spirit has also extended, and is extending itself far and wide in the world; when we observe that in France, in Germany, in Holland, in Switzerland, and in other countries, it has taken possession of Universities, Colleges, and Schools, and is propagating itself by means of Cheap Literature among all orders of Society; when we observe in National Councils an almost utter absence of any recognition of God's Power in the Government of States, and see scarcely any indication there of Fear of His Wrath or of Faith in His Goodness; when we see millions of money voted for material works of transitory splendour and utility, and scarcely any State consecrating its wealth and strength by oblations to true Religion; when we behold Towns laid waste by Floods, and Populations swept away by Famines, and see no Nations sitting in sackcloth and ashes, and bewailing their sins*; when riot and blasphemy and

* This was written *before* the Fast-Day, March 24, 1847: and though it would be presumptuous and delusive to lay much stress on that event, considered in itself, yet the manner, in which that day was generally observed, proves that there still exists in the people of England a powerful religious spirit, which requires only the voice of Authority in high places to elicit and apply it to the great work of our national reformation. *Excoriare aliquis!*

Sabbath-breaking reign unchecked in our streets, while the thunders of the Divine judgments are rolling over our heads, we cannot but look to the Future with the most gloomy apprehensions.

Of remedies there is but one ;—Obedience not to the Pope, not to ourselves, but to God. His Law, especially as revealed in His Word, is our only safe Guide, both as to what we are to believe, and what we are to do. *Scripture*, not as expounded by the changing practice of a corrupt Church, nor by every individual according to his own caprice, (for "no prophecy of the Scripture," as the Apostle teaches*, "is of any private interpretation,") but as interpreted by the teaching and practice of the Christian Church from the beginning, is our only safe Rule ; and this, thanks be to Divine Providence, is, and I trust ever will be, the Rule of the Church of the Country from which I write ; which would be a much happier one than it is, if it had a deeper and more intelligent sense of the blessings which God has given it, and were more thankful for them than it is to Him from Whom they flow.

I am, Sir,
&c. &c.

* 1 Pet. i. 20.

LETTER X.

"Audivi, Domino teste, ejusmodi; ne quis me tam perditum putet ut ultro exagitem libidine styli quæ aliis scrupulum incutiant."—TERTULLIAN. de Bapt. § 12.

MY DEAR SIR,

You have heard of your countryman Pierre Jurieu. You may remember that he was a Calvinist Minister, first at Mer near Blois, and afterwards at Sedan, in the latter half of the seventeenth and the commencement of the eighteenth century. He was a voluminous writer, and signalized himself by a controversy with one of the greatest of your Prelates, the learned and eloquent Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, whose "History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches" he assailed; and Bossuet in return animadverted upon the teaching of Jurieu in several long and elaborate *Avertissemens* or Letters addressed to the *Protestants* of his Diocese.

It is a remarkable fact, that the *Doctrine* of *Development* as now taught in the Church of *Rome* by

Möhler, the Dublin Reviewer, Perrone, the Essayist, and other writers, was broached in all its amplitude in your country more than a century and a half ago, by Peter Jurieu, the *Calvinistic* Minister.

"La Vérité de Dieu," (says Jurieu,) "*n'a été connue que par parcelles—la Théologie des Pères était imparfaite et flottante*. La Théologie Chrétienne se perfectionnait tous les jours. L'Eglise apprend tous les jours de nouvelles Vérités,*" that is, in the Essayist's Language, "Christianity came into the world as an Idea rather than an Institution;" and again (p. 116), "the highest truths could not be comprehended all at once by their recipients," and "the increase and expansion of the Christian Creed and Ritual are the necessary attendants on any philosophy or polity which takes possession of the intellect and heart" (p. 27); and "to be perfect is to have changed often" (p. 39); and "we shall find ourselves unable to fix an historical point at which the growth of doctrine ceased, and the rule of faith was fixed" (p. 107).

But, further, let me specify in detail, certain doctrines which Jurieu alleges as *examples* of Development: "*Le Mystère de la* TRINITÉ†" (says he) "*est de la dernière importance, et essentiel au Christianisme; cependant chacun sait combien ce Mystère*

* See Bossuet, I., Avertissement iii. § 3. 27, and 36.

† Ibid. § 6. See also Avertissement, vi. § 24.

demeura INFORME*, *jusqu'au premier concile de Nicée et même jusqu'à celui de Constantinople,*" that is, as the "Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine" represents the matter, "Let us allow that the whole circle of doctrines of which our Lord is the subject, was consistently and uniformly confessed by the Primitive Church; but, surely, it is *otherwise with the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity* †."

Again, the doctrine of the *eternal* generation of our Lord, according to Jurieu, was not taught by the Primitive Church. "*Que le Verbe n'est pas éternel en tant que Fils; qu'il était seulement caché dans le sein de son Père, comme sapience, et qu'il fut comme produit et devint* UNE PERSONNE DISTINCTE *de celle du Père peu avant la Création, et qu'ainsi la Trinité des Personnes* NE COMMENÇA *qu'un peu avant le monde; telle était la Théologie des Anciens, celle de l'Eglise des trois premiers Siècles sur la Trinité; celle d'Athénagoras, de Justin Martyr, de Tatien,*" &c.

Precisely similar to this is the sense which the Essayist desires us to put on his quotation ‡ from Waterland. "The Authors who make the generation *temporary*, and speak not expressly of any other, are these following, Justin, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Tatian, Tertullian, and Hippolytus;" and again we read (p. 407), "I have said that there was in

* I follow Bossuet's CAPITALS citing Jurieu's words.
† P. 11.
‡ P. 13.

the first ages no public and ecclesiastical recognition of the place which St. Mary holds in the Economy of grace; this was reserved for the fifth century, as the definition of our *Lord's proper Divinity* had been the work of the fourth."

Again, on *Original Sin*, the Calvinist teacher says, "*Le péché originel est conçu comme l'un des importans articles de la Religion Chrétienne; cependant je le défie de me faire voir cette importante vérité dans les Pères qui ont précédé S. Augustin, toute formée, toute conçue comme elle a été depuis**."

* There is a mixture of truth in every error, however dangerous (indeed errors are dangerous mainly *on this account*); and we should be very ungrateful to Divine Providence, Whose peculiar attribute it is to bring good out of evil, if we did not allow that some doctrines of Christianity have been illustrated more clearly, and have been established more firmly, even through the *denial* of them by *heretical* teachers, who by their heresies have aroused the zeal and called forth the learning of orthodox Theologians, for the more careful study of the *Scriptures*, and for the vindication and confirmation of the truth from them. (See S. Aug. in Psalm liv. et Psalm lxvii.) "Illorum error nobis proficit." (S. Ambrose De Incarn. iv. vi.) Thus S. Aug. says (i. p. 1213), "Ecclesia omnibus errantibus utitur ad provectus suos, Gentibus ad materiam operationis suæ, hæreticis ad probationem doctrinæ suæ, schismaticis ad documentum stabilitatis suæ, Judæis ad comparationem pulchritudinis suæ." Again (iii. 2056), "Multi hæretici abundant, et cœperunt fluctare corda fidelium. Jam tum necessitas facta est spiritualibus viris, qui aliquid secundum divinitatem Domini nostri Jesu Christi non solum *legerant in Evangelio* sed etiam *intellexerant*, ut contra arma Diaboli Christi arma proferrent, et de Christi divinitate adversus falsos fallacesque doctores quantis possent viribus apertissimâ conflictatione pugnarent, ne cum ipsi tacerent, alii perirent." Again (iv. p. 730), "Ex hæreticis asserta est Catholica, &c.;" and vii. 661, "Multa quippe ad fidem Catholicam pertinentia, dum hæreticorum calidâ inquietudine exagitantur ut adversus eos defendi possint, et considerantur dili-

Similarly, as if he had been one of Jurieu's disciples, your new convert says, that "the Doctrine of *Original Sin* can allege little definite testimony before the fifth century;" and, as we have seen, he classes it with Purgatory as to the time of its appearance in the World.

But now, my dear Sir, let us inquire what your great Prelate Bossuet, your Champion of Catholicism, your severe Censor of what he terms the "Variations of the Protestant Churches," had to say to all these allegations?

Bossuet, as I have said, is writing to the Protestant disciples of Jurieu; and the object of his "*Aver-*

gentius, et intelliguntur clarius, et instantius prædicantur; et ab adversario mota quæstio discendi existit occasio." So a Pelagius called forth an Augustine; and the denial of the doctrine of original sin led to the fuller proof that it *cannot be denied* by any one who receives the *Scriptures* as the Word of God. But this doctrine, like *all other Catholic doctrines that have been denied*, as Augustine rightly states the case (vol. iii. 102. iv. 730. 978), is contained in *Scripture*, and ever *has been* in *Scripture*, as long as Scripture has existed; and Scripture has always contained the command,—both implicitly, as being God's revelation to man; and explicitly, in direct precepts,—that *itself should be searched*. "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." We may presume, we can prove, that the Primitive Church obeyed this command; and we know that it had the advantage of the *oral* teaching of Apostles and Apostolic men, as well as special *charismata*, or Spiritual gifts, for the clearer understanding of Holy Writ. But *if* any new doctrines, unknown to the Primitive Church, *could* be propounded now (which we deny), they must be *proved* from *Scripture;* but the new *Roman* doctrines *cannot* be *proved* from Scripture, but *can* be *disproved* by it. Nor, *if* new doctrinal developments from Scripture were to be ever expected, could they come by a Church like that of Rome, which treats Scripture with the most wanton and profane irreverence.

tissemens" was to direct their attention to the nature and tendency of their Teacher's Statements.

The title he prefixes to his first Advertisement is very ominous: *Le Christianisme flétri, le Socinianisme autorisé par ce Ministre.* Turn now to the Address itself. In the third section you will find the following language: "That (says Bossuet) which your Minister cannot digest, is what I affirm to be true; viz. that the Faith never varies in the Church; and that the Faith which came from God had its consummation *at once* (*avait d'abord sa perfection*), that it was well known *from the beginning.* Your Minister (Jurieu) affirms that the Divine Truth was only developed by degrees (*par parcelles*). He asserts * that the Mystery of the Trinity remained undeveloped up to the Council of Nice. Would you, I ask, my brethren, have conceived it possible that you should ever have heard such language as this except from the mouth of a *Socinian?* He says that the † Fathers of the early Church held that the Divine Word is not Eternal as Son of the Father; such, he alleges, was the teaching of the first three centuries. Would you have ever dreamt that a Pastor should broach such language as this? Can he be called a Pastor, and not rather a *Wolf* who comes to tear the flock? Is it not time for you, therefore, to arouse yourselves, when he who pre-

* Sect. 6. † Sect. 7.

tends to be your Teacher and a Prophet, is guilty of such extravagances as to confound Christian Martyrs with Arians and with men even more impious than they, by representing them as rejecting one of the essential doctrines of Christianity, the eternity of the Son of God?

"Your Minister tells you, that he has dilated on the Theology of the First Three Centuries concerning the Trinity, because he finds that no one is familiar with that subject. And what is his own discovery? He affirms, that the ages nearest to the Apostles, in which resided the force and glory of Christianity, had no clear notions of this mystery! If this *horrible libel* on Christianity, this so evident corruption of the Faith, is not a fulfilment of the prediction of the Apostle, that 'their folly shall be manifest unto all men,' (2 Tim. iii. 9,) I know not what is.

"Again, he tells you, (continues Bossuet*,) that the Doctrine of *Original Sin* is regarded as one of the most important of Christianity, and yet he defies me to show it you in the Fathers who preceded St. Augustine, although, not to cite other authors, it is found in a Council held by Cyprian †, and on the

* Sect. 15.

† Here incidentally a very striking proof presents itself to us of the radical vice of Romish Theology. Bossuet speaks of "other authors," and refers to two Councils, but says not a word concerning SCRIPTURE; as if the plain assertion of the doctrine of Original Sin *there* did not at once prove it to be *primitive*. But the professions of unscriptural and anti-scriptural doctrines (as necessary to salvation)

foundation of *Original Sin* is there established the necessity of *Infant Baptism*, as strongly as in the later Council of Milevis.

"In order to expose to you more clearly the delusions with which he endeavours to ensnare you, can there, I ask, be a greater error than to suppose that the Faith of the Church only developed itself as heresies arose, and she made explicit decisions concerning it *? On the contrary, the Church never pronounced any judgments, except by way of propounding the *Faith of the Past*. Thus, at the fourth General Council (that of Chalcedon) the Church began † with laying this foundation: 'This Holy Synod follows and receives the Faith proclaimed at Nicæa, and confirmed at Ephesus and Constantinople; and it *will add nothing to it, and take nothing from it*;' and if this Council had heard any one say that the Faith was not then fully developed, it would have denounced such an assertion as blasphemy (comme *un blasphème*); and this Council affirmed that the Faith of the Church in the doctrine of the Trinity had been declared in the profession that she believes in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

"If your Minister does not credit what *I* have said, and will not read the learned Treatise of Father

in their Church, disables Romanists from using this argument against Heresy and Infidelity; against which the principle of the sound Catholic Church, and of the English branch of it, viz. *Scripture*, interpreted by Reason and Antiquity, is the only safeguard.

* Sect. 29. † Art. IV.

Thomassin, or the erudite Preface of Petavius *, which is the explanation of his doctrine on this subject, I refer him to the learned English Protestant, *Bull*, who has so well defended the Ante-Nicene Fathers. You must renounce, which God forbid, your Faith in the Trinity, or else believe with me that Bull is right. And Antiquity is no less clear on the other points." Such is the language of Bossuet.

My dear Sir, let us pause here, and review what is now before us. You see, from what I have said in this Letter, that the Theory of Development of Christian Doctrine is no novelty; that it was propounded in your own country more than a century and a half ago. And by whom? By a Socinianizing Calvinist Minister, who exhibited it, as to details, in precisely the same manner as your new convert has done. I might remind you that it subsequently found support from another quarter in your country —I mean from Voltaire. He found it a most effectual instrument for diffusing Infidelity, as you may see, if you will read his execrable article on

* The Preface to his second volume of Dogmata Theologica, in which Petavius retracted what he had before said on the subject; see Bossuet, Avertiss. vi. § 100, "s'est reduit en termes formels à des sentimens orthodoxes;" with which may be contrasted the assertion of the Dublin Reviewer, June, 1845, p. 345, that "much stupid and unjust indignation has been excited against Petavius for his straightforward language about some of the earlier Fathers;"—which Petavius himself recanted!

"Christianity" in his Philosophical Dictionary *. But I return to M. Jurieu How was this Theory received by your Church, when propounded by him? What its fate *might* have been *if* his design had been, as the aim of the work of our English Essayist is, to point to a self-styled Infallible Judge as necessary to fix the faith of a wavering world, I cannot pretend to say. Petavius escaped censure; still he was induced to recant; but Jurieu was not a Jesuit, but a Calvinist: and one of the greatest Prelates whom France ever produced, Bossuet, stepped down, as we see, from his Episcopal Throne, to warn the *Protestants* of France against the "Doctrine of Development," and to anathematize it as impious and blasphemous; as insulting to Christianity and to its Divine Author. But now mark the difference! Formerly, a Bishop of France, the eagle of Meaux, appealed to the writings of Bishop Bull, and in the name of the French Clergy †, thanked the Anglican Divine for his services to Catholic Truth; but now the Church of France prefers Jurieu to Bossuet! Formerly Bossuet warned French *Protestants* against the heresies of their Pastor; now, an English Protestant, who, alas! has denied his baptism, bears a book in his hands containing precisely the same

* As, for example, vol. ii. p. 151, ed. 1764, "Vers le neuvième Siècle l'Eglise Latine statua *par degrés* que le St. Esprit procède du Père et Fils."

† See Bossuet's Letter in Nelson's Life of Bull, p. 329.

language as that denounced by Bossuet, and he is received with open arms by your Church, as if he were a Confessor! he is caressed by your Archbishop, Bishops, and Clergy, and by the Apostolic Nuncio at Paris, his book is lauded and lectured on by the Princes of your Church, he is lodged in the Propaganda at Rome, and "receives a crucifix from the Pope!"

Oh for a Protestant Bossuet to write the "*Variations*" of Rome!

I am, dear Sir,
Yours, very faithfully,
&c. &c.

LETTER XI.

"Non potuit fieri ut Ecclesia universa, imprimis Ecclesia primorum sæculorum, in fundamentis religionis erraret. Quæ vero fuerit publica et passim recepta primorum sæculorum doctrina, e priscorum doctorum consensu patet."—GEORG. CALIXT. in Procem. in Augustin. de Doct. Christ.

"Romanists are great pretenders to Catholic Tradition or Primitive Antiquity, and yet the fact is so full and plain against them, that we can point out when, where, and how, every corruption almost commenced, and every innovation crept in. . . They screen themselves under modern Infallibility, and take sanctuary in their own authority, as sole judges of every thing, rather than rest the issue of the cause upon a strict inquiry into ancient fact."—WATERLAND, x. 325.

MY DEAR SIR,

You will, perhaps, have felt some concern and surprise, that (as I showed in my last Letter) the Church of Rome, by receiving the Author of the "Essay on Development" into her communion, has identified herself with opinions which were denounced by Bossuet as heretical. I confess that I am more grieved than astonished at this. As I before said, the "Essay on Development" is a true exposition of Romish principles in their results*.

* For this reason I have drawn so largely in these Letters from the Essay on Development. Compare above, pp. 8 and 9.

Doubtless many of her members have paid due homage to Christian Antiquity. It is a pleasing task to commemorate the invaluable labours of the Benedictine* Congregation of St. Maur, in the cause of Patristic Literature; but it cannot be denied that the Church of Rome, in her public capacity, has no regard for *any* authority except that of her *present self*, and that she will compel every one to bow to that—if she can. In this respect, as in others, she has become more corrupt as she has grown older. Formerly, she professed great reverence for the early Fathers of the Church, and censured those who dared to criticize them. How indignant was she with the Magdeburgh Centuriators, because they would not receive all their writings as infallible authorities in matters of faith! Those indefatigable annalists were innovators, heretics, and what not! "God forbid that I should give up the inheritance of my Fathers," she was wont then to exclaim. Again—"Plain it is that the Fathers stand with us, and against the Protestants†."

* It is a very curious fact, that one of the most eminent Benedictine Divines, Charles de la Rue, poured forth a complaint of the inquisitorial tyranny exercised over the Benedictine Press, in a private letter to the great Cambridge Aristarchus, Paris, 1 Jan. 1724. "Ex Walkero audies quàm duro hìc ceu Romanæ Inquisitionis jugo premamur, Regiis verius dicam Jesuiticis censoribus in id unum intentis, ut cuilibet ex eorum sodalitio qui Bullam Pontificiam, quæ incipit *Unigenitus*, venerabundi non suscipiunt, causam aliquam inveniant quamobrem imprimendi venia denegetur."—De la Rue's Letter in Bentley's Correspondence, p. 611.

† Bristow, Motives (ed. 1599, pp. 64—69) to the Catholike Faith.

But *now*, times are altered. The Fathers are much less in favour with her than formerly. It has been proved that many of the Decretals ascribed to her ancient Popes*, which were formerly cited as evidence in favour of the Papal claims, are forgeries, and that Popes† and Prelates of the Church of Rome have tampered with the text of Synodical Canons. It has been shown that the Fathers of the first six, seven, yes, of the first ten centuries of the Church knew nothing of certain doctrines which the Church of Rome now affirms to be necessary to Salvation, and that they condemn others which she requires to be believed. Therefore, the tables are turned. *Now* she says—The Fathers are of very little value; the great articles of Christianity were not developed in their days. They lived too soon; they were mere novices in Theology; *we* are much wiser than they were—*πατέρων μέγ' ἀμείνονες εὐχόμεθ' εἶναι*—as Salmeron‡ says, "quo juniores eo perspicaciores sunt Doctores§." Now, as it

* See Fleury, Discours iv. de l'Histoire Ecclesiastique, pp. 159. 290. Buddei Isagoge, 757—763.

† *e. g.* Popes Zosimus, Boniface, and Celestine, with the decrees of Nicæa. See full evidence on these points in an English work, Lond. 1673, entitled "Roman Forgeries," pp. 12, 13. 17. 30. 32. 40. The supposititious decrees were inserted as genuine in the Councils of the Church published by Merlin, Crabbe, Carranza, Surius, Turrian, and others; but finally their spuriousness was allowed by Bellarmine and Baronius.

‡ Salmeron, in Ep. ad Rom. dis. 51, p. 468.

§ "Viderunt jam olim Jesuitæ traditiones scriptas quas apud rerum antiquarum ignaros magnifico tumore verborum ostentare solent

were with the parricidal spirit of a Tullia, the Church of Rome drives her chariot over their bodies, wherever they are an impediment in her way.

This temper has animated her for some time, as I have said; she formerly claimed the Fathers as her own; but even *then*, whenever it was suggested that they *might* possibly be found to be *against* her, she made no secret of her resolution, that they should yield to her, and not she to them. Thus, Thomas Aquinas* says, "The Catholic Doctors *derive* their authority from the Church (*i. e.* of Rome); therefore we must abide by their judgment rather than by that of Augustine, Jerome, or any other Doctor." And the same Aquinas affirms, that "the authority of the Church resides mainly in the Pope†;" and therefore an Italian Bishop thus writes:—"To speak the truth candidly, I would rather believe one single Pope in a matter of Faith, than a thousand Augustines, Jeromes, or Gregories; for I believe and know that the Pope cannot err in questions of doctrine, since the authority of determining all things which relate to Faith resides in him‡."

Hence, to descend for a while to particulars, we

in plerisque fidei Romanæ capitibus nutare. Id autem cum fateri non possint, contendunt hodie passim negligendam esse Antiquitatem, in permultis recentiorum auctoritatem esse anteponendam."—Vindic. contra Harduin. p. 5.

* Cited by Dens, ii. 6, who calls this a "digna sententia."

† Qu. ii. art. 3, ad 3.

‡ Cornelius Mussus, Bishop of Bitonto, in Epist. ad Rom. xiv. p. 606.

are not at all astonished to hear Cardinal Bellarmine say that St. Cyprian was "guilty* of mortal sin," because he resisted Pope Stephen in the matter of heretical baptism, though St. Augustine was of a different opinion: nor does it surprise us to find that Melchior Canus and the Council of Trent rejected St. Jerome's authority concerning the Canon of the Old Testament, although it had before been received as paramount by the Church of Rome: nor do we wonder that the same celebrated Bishop should say, that "there is no certain conclusion derivable from the *unanimous consent* of the Fathers†;" (although, as you remember, your Clergy all take a solemn oath—the Trent oath—that they will never interpret Scripture, "*except* according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers;") for, adds Canus, as an example of their erroneous teaching—it "is the unanimous opinion of the Fathers that the Virgin Mary was not exempt from original sin, but the contrary opinion is piously held in the Church"

* "Videtur mortaliter peccásse." Bellarmine, de Rom. Pontif. IV. c. vii.

† Melchior Canus, Loci Theol. vii. c. 1. "De communi sanctorum consensione nihil certi in Theologiâ conficitur, id quod hoc etiam argumento confirmari potest. Sancti namque omnes qui in ejus rei mentionem inciderunt, uno ore asseverarunt beatam Virginem in peccato originali conceptam . . . et cum nullus sanctorum contravenerit, infirmum tamen ex omnium auctoritate argumentum ducitur, quin potius contraria sententia et probabiliter et pie in Ecclesia defenditur;" and lib. vi. 4. "Anathematizamus omnes qui contra Sanctam Romanam et Apostolicam Ecclesiam suas erigunt cervices."

(*i. e.* of Rome); and it appears, therefore, from the same writer, that all the Fathers (to whom we may add all the writers of Holy Scripture) would be liable to be put into the prisons of the Roman Inquisition as heretics on this point, if they were now alive*. Nor are we surprised to find that your Petavius affirms that the Ante-Nicene Fathers were heretical on the doctrine of the Trinity, or that your Huet charges them with Arianism, or that the Author of the Essay on Development, who represents them as speaking in ambiguous terms concerning the most vital articles of Christianity, has been received with open arms by the Church of Rome.

"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee!" O Church of Rome, once glorious in thy gifts, but now cruel and treacherous, "in thee is found the blood of Prophets and of Saints." She may worship the relics of their bodies, but she mutilates the remains of their minds, and would make them suffer the worst of deaths,—that of their reputation as Christian confessors. Papal Rome is more cruel than Imperial; the latter made them martyrs, the other would make them traitors to Christ.

The Church of Rome knows full well that there must be *Authority somewhere* in controverted matters of Faith. She knows that whoever sets up to

* P. 606, lib. xii. c. 7.

teach himself without any other aid, is the scholar of the worst master, and that *this* system cannot stand; it must lead to a confusion of tongues. She perceives that, if she can but subvert the authority of the Primitive Church, her cause is gained.

Hence, therefore, she *assumes* a superiority over the ancient Fathers and Councils of the Church. She is very willing that they should be misrepresented as speaking erroneously or equivocally on those articles, which the majority of Christians, whether Protestant or Romanist, receive as fundamental, in order that an opinion may be created that the world is indebted to *her* for those doctrines; as for instance, that without the Church of *Rome* there would be no such thing as belief in the Trinity, or in the Divinity of our Lord, and no such practice as Infant Baptism: and this impression being once produced among unreflecting persons in her favour, and a prejudice against the teaching and practice of the primitive Apostolic Churches being created at the same time, she then proceeds to insinuate all her other false and corrupt doctrines, such as transubstantiation, purgatory, adoration of Saints and Angels, *against which*, she is well aware, the ancient Catholic Church speaks in a voice of condemnation not to be mistaken.

Be it observed, also, that the Church of Rome having undermined the credit of the Fathers, does by implication overthrow the authority of the *Scrip-*

tures also: for the Fathers had the Scriptures in their hands, and if she can show that with the Bible before them they spoke doubtfully or heretically concerning the great doctrines of Christianity, such as the Trinity, and our Lord's Divine Nature, then it may be inferred that these Doctrines cannot be proved from Scripture, or, at least, are not plainly set forth there, and that Scripture, therefore, is not the Rule of Faith.

Thus by disparaging Antiquity she unsettles all the Foundations of Christianity, and makes room for her own claims. Thus she would fain tempt us to believe that we must be Papists if we would not be Infidels.

I have said that she assumes a superiority over the Fathers and Councils of the Ancient Church. This she has shown *à priori* by affirming, that *if* Councils or Fathers speak in opposition to *her*, they are to be regarded as, *pro tanto*, of no authority. Secondly, she *exercises* this assumed superiority in practice by mutilating, or, as she terms it, correcting the records of the Early Church. Sixtus Senensis * commended Pope Pius V. for the care he took "in purging all the compositions of Catholic writers, and specially those of the ancient Fathers:" and the mode in which this work of purgation was performed

* Epist. dedicat. ad Pium V. P. M. "Expurgari et emaculari curâsti omnia Catholicorum scriptorum ac præcipuè veterum Patrum scripta."

may be conceived from the following examples. St. Augustine says, "Faith only justifies"—"Our works cannot save us"—"Marriage is allowed to all"—"Peter erred in the question of clean and unclean meats"—"St. John cautions us against the invocation of Saints." The holy bishop (says the Church of Rome) is to be corrected in all * these places. St. Chrysostom teaches that "Christ forbids heretics to be put to death;" that "to adore martyrs is anti-christian;" that "the reading of Scripture is needful to all;" that "there is no merit but from Christ;" that it is "a proud thing to detract from or add to Scripture;" that "Bishops and Priests are subject to the higher powers;" that the "Prophets had wives." The venerable Patriarch must be freed from all these heretical notions. Epiphanius affirms that "no creature is to be worshipped." This is an error, and must be expunged. St. Jerome asserts that "all Bishops are equal;" he must here be amended. And, further, the Fathers are not only to be corrected by *subtraction*, but by *addition* also. Thus Cyprian is to be *made* to say, "hîc Petro primatus datur," and "qui cathedram Petri, super quam fundata est Ec-

* I copy these passages from the Index Expurgatorius Impensis Lazari Zetzneri, 1599. This Index was not to be published. See Præf. B. 6. "Prælati in omnibus urbibus ubi bibliopolæ inhabitant unum et item alterum sibi deligere poterunt, quos idoneos judicabunt, sedulos et fideles; iique ipsi privatim nullisque consciis apud se Indicem expurgatorium habebunt, quem eundem neque aliis communicabunt, neque ejus exemplum ulli dabunt."

clesia descrit, in Ecclesiâ se esse confidit *?" against his own practice, for which he has been condemned by Bellarmine as guilty of mortal sin. All this is not wonderful, since the Church of Rome has not spared even the Word of God. In the Roman Index† we read "deleatur illud, 'Abraham fide justus,'" which is the assertion of St. Paul ‡.

Nor is this all: your divines proceed to teach us that the Fathers ought to be very grateful to the Pope for all his solicitude in the revision of their works after their death! The Fathers of the Church (say they) are children of the Pope; and when "the Pope revises the lucubrations of his children, and corrects them where it is necessary, he discharges an office gratifying to the writers and useful to posterity, and in good truth he then performs a work of mercy to his sons §." Oh most meek and modest Pastor, to claim to be the Father of Jerome,

* See Dr. James on the Corruption of the True Fathers, p. 114, ed. 1688.

† P. 48. See other passages of Scripture, expunged by the Church of Rome, in Dr. James's Work, p. 427; and compare Mr. Mendham's valuable work on the "Literary Policy of the Church of Rome," Lond. 1830, p. 142.

‡ Gal. iii. 6. Rom. iv. 3.

§ Gretser, de Jure Prohibendi Libros, ii. c. 9, Ingolstad, 1603. "Omnes scriptores Catholici scripta sua omnia subjiciunt Ecclesiæ aut Summo Pontifici vel expressè vel tacitè, ita ut *velint*, si a recto veroque uspiam deflexerint, corrigi, sive vivant adhuc, sive post mortem . . . Ecclesia aut Summus Pontifex dum *filiorum suorum* lucubrationes revidet, et ubi opus est corrigit, gratum ipsis autoribus præstat obsequium et utilem operam posteritati, atque adeò verissimè tunc exhibet *filiis* suis opus *misericordiæ*."

Chrysostom, Augustine, and St. Paul! Oh! most benign and merciful Parent, to mangle the limbs of his children, and then to call on them to look on him with a smile of gratitude!

What then, Sir, does all this amount to? Not only, if the teaching and practice of the Church of Rome is *right*, are the Fathers, and Councils, and Scriptures *wrong*, but the question arises, Why did the Fathers write any thing? why did Councils ever meet? why were the Scriptures given to the world by the Holy Spirit? If the Church of Rome really *is* what she pretends to be, then all these things are vain: they exist only to be censured and despised.

Let me now, my dear Sir, say a few words concerning the treatment which the Fathers receive at *our* hands. I have already touched on this subject in a former Letter, but you will pardon me for reverting to it here, lest I should seem to be eager *only* to *pull down*—a most unprofitable proceeding, especially in matters of religion. First, then, we do *not* mutilate their works. We have no inquisitorial censorship to put them to the rack, to make them speak what we dictate to them. We have no Expurgatory Indices. We collect their precious Remains, and are grateful to all, of any country in the world, who take part in this good work *. We

* It is a remarkable fact, that although Italy was the first country in Europe that had the advantage of the revival of ancient Litera-

do not receive their works as our Rule of Faith. Scripture, only and entirely, (that is, not *one* passage taken singly, but spiritual things *compared* with spiritual,) is *that*. But for the *interpretation* of Scripture, we believe that the Fathers, when read under the guidance of sound Reason and Divine Grace given to earnest prayer, are of great use. We do not use them in order to add new doctrines to Scripture, but to guard the old, and to secure them against all novel additions. We do not use them to complete the Rule of Scripture, for that is perfect, but to ensure its right application. We regard Antiquity not as the vineyard of Divine Truth, but as a hedge about it, to secure it from the "wild boar out of the wood, and from the wild beasts of the field*;" from the Pope, and from every one who would be like a Pope; from the Divines of Trent, who, on the plea of Scripture being *imperfect*, would preach to us another Gospel; and from those, who, *under colour* of being zealous for the †

ture consequent on the emigration of the Byzantine Greeks; and though her libraries are very rich in MSS., yet scarcely any edition of any one of the earlier Greek Fathers has appeared in Italy; and I do not recollect *any* one Greek Father (except Ephraem Syrus, 1732, and Dionysius Alexandrinus, 1796,) printed at *Rome*.

* Ps. lxxx. 13.

† See Waterland, x. 283. "Faustus Socinus, under colour of extolling the *perfection* of *Scripture*, studied nothing so much as to blazon his own parts and abilities, deserting the ancients, and trusting to himself and his uncle Lælius. He presumed to set up his own fond conceits as the measure of all truth, which was advancing a new Rule of Faith. It might be shown on the other hand that

perfection of Scripture, do indeed *make it imperfect* by forcing their own private and novel interpretations of it upon us, as if they were Scripture. We know that the Fathers had the strongest motives for examining, and the best opportunities of ascertaining, the sense of Scripture. Some of them enjoyed the benefit of the oral teaching of the Apostles; they participated in spiritual gifts which were shed in gracious abundance on the early Church; they possessed many Christian writings which are now lost; many of them spoke the same language as the Apostles, and spent many years in studying and preaching the Word; and not a few of them proved the sincerity of their belief by laying down their lives for the Faith; and therefore we think that we should be doing a great injury to ourselves, and be guilty of great folly and ingratitude to God, Who raised them up for the "perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ *," if we did not pay respectful deference to their teaching; and we feel satisfied that any doctrine, which we can prove to have been unknown to them, or, much more, to have been condemned by them, especially in their public Synods and Creeds, and Confessions of Faith, is no doctrine of Scripture, is no part of the sacred "*deposit*" entrusted by

they who have adhered strictly to *Antiquity* have done most honour to the *perfection* of *Scripture*."

* Eph. iv. 12.

Christ and His Apostles to the Church, is no article of the Faith once for all (ἅπαξ) delivered to the saints *, and is therefore not to be required of any man to be believed as necessary to Salvation, but, on the contrary, is an erroneous and *strange* doctrine, is a "profane and vain babbling †" of false teachers, "whose word will eat as doth a canker ‡."

The difference, therefore, between the Churches of Rome and of England in their treatment of Christian Antiquity is this. The Church of Rome, which is only a branch, and a very unsound one, of the Universal Church, sets up her *present self* as the Standard to which all the teaching of the Apostles, and Apostolic men, Saints, Martyrs, Confessors, and Councils must bow; the Church of England knows

* Jude 3. † 2 Tim. ii. 16.

‡ Even Daillé, who is chargeable with great unfairness toward the Fathers, is more just to them than the Church of Rome. "There sometimes arise" (says Daillé, Right Use of the Fathers, pp. 187—190, ed. Lond. 1674,) "such troublesome spirits as will needs broach doctrines devised of their own head; the authority of the ancients may very properly and seasonably be used against the impudence of those men, by showing that the Fathers were utterly ignorant of any such fancies as they proposed to the world. And if this can be proved, we ought then certainly to conclude that *no such doctrine was ever preached* either by our Saviour Christ or His Apostles. For what probability is there that those holy Doctors of former ages, from whose hands Christianity hath been derived down to us, should be ignorant of any of those things which had been revealed and recommended by our Saviour as important to salvation? And thus you see that the Authority of the Fathers is of very great use in the Church, and serveth as an outwork to the Scriptures, for the repelling of the presumption of those who would forge a new Faith."

no other Standard of Doctrine but Scripture; and she thinks that there is no better Exposition of Scripture than the practice and teaching of the Universal Church in and from the times of the Apostles. She believes that every one who will honestly apply this Rule, under the guidance of Reason and of Grace, will never go far astray, and will be safe from the pernicious influence of the two false systems of Theology, which are now unhappily prevalent; in one of which there is a Pope for every man, and in the other every man is a Pope for himself.

I am, dear Sir,

Yours, &c.

LETTER XII.

"Mox trahitur manibus Regum fortuna retortis."
HOR. II. Ep. i. 191.

MY DEAR SIR,

Among the most interesting remains, now surviving at Rome, of its ancient glory, are its triumphal arches, and the two columns of the Emperors Trajan and Marcus Aurelius. The arches remind us of those magnificent processions which passed along the road on which these fabrics stand; and in contemplating them we seem to behold the captive princes and generals, the spoils and trophies, the crowned victims, and the lictors with their wreathed fasces, which preceded the car of the conqueror as he rode along the Sacred Way, followed by his laurelled legions, through the Roman forum to the Capitol. On the columns we view lively representations in marble of military campaigns with their attendant operations,—the making of roads and bridges, the

felling of timber, the fortification of camps, the scaling of fortresses, and all the series of the imperial victor's exploits wound round the column, as it were, in a gently ascending spiral, which carries the conqueror upward on a gradual acclivity of toil to a sublime eminence of glory.

Such are the existing memorials of the *temporal* prowess of the heathen mistress of the ancient world. By them we are naturally induced to pass to a consideration of the conquests of *Christian* Rome. If we could imagine a triumph (such as those of old) of the *Papal* power; if we could represent in fact, what the last Pope, Gregory XVI., who has written a book with that title, *calls Il Trionfo della Chiesa*,—The *Triumph* of the *Church* of *Rome*,—of what materials, Sir, would it consist? You, as an enthusiastic Romanist, would say that the picture is easy to be drawn. Foreign nations brought under the gentle yoke of Christianity, the banner of the cross unfurled in lands beyond the limits of the ancient world, heresies put to flight, peace and truth proclaimed, and the pure faith every where victorious; —these (you would assert) are the accompaniments of the triumph of the Church of Rome.

Alas! my dear Sir, I cannot in any way participate in your opinion that this is the case. I confess, for my own part, that I cannot by any means indulge in such pleasing imaginations as these. *My* representation of a triumph of the Church of Rome would

be very different from this. It is impossible to think without deep sorrow of the infliction of human suffering with which the glory of *Heathen* Rome was purchased: no one can look on these arches and columns, to which I have just referred, without a bitter pang for the anguish and ignominy endured by those who succumbed beneath the victor's yoke, and served to adorn his triumph. But it is with feelings of *far greater grief and shame* that I reflect on what the human race has endured from the power of *Papal* Rome, and on the sacrifices which *her* triumphs have cost the world. The former, I mean the *temporal* conquests of Rome, affected the *body* mainly; beneath the chains, with which the captive's limbs were loaded, there often breathed the indomitable *mind*. Britain was subdued, but the heart of Caractacus was invincible: Numidia was subjugated, but nothing could bend the spirit of Jugurtha. But look at the conquests of Pontifical Rome. They concern the *soul*. In *her* triumphal processions man's *Reason* is led captive, his *Conscience* is in chains, his *Will* groans beneath a yoke, his immortal Spirit is bowed to the dust. Nor is this all. The arch of the Emperor Titus represents in sculpture the table of shewbread, the golden candlestick, and other spoils of the Jewish temple,—that is, all that was most precious and venerable in the eye of an Israelite, carried in triumph by the conqueror after the taking of Jerusa-

lem. But this was only a victory over the *dead*. The Levitical candles were extinct, now that the light of the Gospel had once been kindled; the shewbread of the law had been spiritualized into the word of life; and now that the Christian Church was formed, the Jewish ark was a cenotaph. But alas! the "lively oracles" of God are borne in triumph by papal Rome. Prophets and Apostles are forced to pass under her yoke. *Scripture* is her slave. Again, on the arch of Constantine stand Dacian, Scythian, and Parthian princes in chains; and that of the Emperor Septimius Severus commemorates his victories over the kings of Arabia; but the venerable *Fathers* of the Christian *Church* of the East and of the West must stoop their necks beneath the stern yoke of the Church of Rome. The Chrysostoms and Basils of Asia, the Cyprians and Augustines of Africa, must stand with their hands tied, to wait her pleasure, and to do homage to her will. And not content with having *Reason, Scripture,* and *Antiquity* as her captives, she must also have *Kings* and *States* as her vassals to swell her triumphal train:—

"Mox trahitur manibus Regum fortuna retortis *."

She glories in making Princes and Nations crouch beneath her sway.

I have already endeavoured to show in my former

* Hor. II. Ep. i. 191.

Letters that what I have here stated is borne out by the fullest evidence, so far as it concerns *Reason, Scripture, and Antiquity.* There it has been proved that *they* are regarded and treated by Rome as her slaves: the topic which now remains to be examined is that which regards *Civil Governments;* and to that I would now request your attention.

You, my dear Sir, are a subject of a monarchy; and you are, I am sure, equally desirous with myself that our respective countries should enjoy those blessings of internal peace, which constitute their real happiness, and on which their national security depends. It is true, we are not agreed on the *means* by which this end is to be *attained;* but I believe we are convinced that one of the greatest public questions of the present day is this, what is the true nature of the authority of sovereign powers, (whether that authority may happen to be reposed in one, or *diffused among many,*) and how far it is and ought to be affected by the papal claims?

Writing to you from England, I shall beg leave to treat this subject mainly as it concerns this country; not, however, neglecting the condition of affairs with you, which, I think, will be found very instructive by all who desire to form a correct opinion on this important subject.

To proceed, then, without further preliminary, to the question before us. With us in England, who live under a monarchy as you do, the Royal Supre-

macy is exercised in affairs of two kinds, viz. Civil and Ecclesiastical. Hence it is that as subjects we take two *oaths* to our Sovereign, one of *Civil* Allegiance, the other of *Ecclesiastical* Supremacy*. It will presently appear that the ecclesiastical jurisdiction is intimately connected with the civil, and that whatever encroaches on the one must impair the other. But let us speak, in the first instance, of that authority of sovereigns and governing powers which is purely *temporal*. How is this affected by the Papal claims?

You perhaps may say in reply, "It is not affected by them at all." The Pope (you may, probably, affirm) has universal *spiritual* supremacy, but he leaves sovereigns and states to exercise their temporal power without let or hindrance on his part. I must beg to dissent wholly from this opinion. I affirm that the Pope *does* claim, not only *spiritual*, but *temporal* authority over all subjects, states, and

* By Geo. I. Stat. ii. c. 13, these oaths are to be taken by every person on admission to any office, ecclesiastical, academical, civil, naval, or military. The Oath of Allegiance is:—"I, A. B., do sincerely promise and swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to her Majesty Queen Victoria. So help me God." The Oath of the Queen's Supremacy will be found in the Book of Common Prayer, in the "Form and Manner of making of Deacons." "I, A. B., do swear that I do from my heart abhor, detest, and abjure as impious and heretical that damnable doctrine and position, that princes, excommunicated by the Pope, or any authority of the see of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects or by any other whatsoever. And I do declare that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate, hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within these realms. So help me God."

sovereigns ; and with your leave I will now proceed to prove this assertion.

I shall not trouble you with any reference to the opinions and affirmations, in behalf of the Pope's alleged *temporal* supremacy, of any of your great Romanist divines, although they were Cardinals of the Roman court, and may therefore be supposed to speak with authority, such, for instance, as Bellarmine and Baronius, still less of any unaccredited individuals whatsoever: but I shall proceed at once to the *Pope's own assertions* and *acts*, in reference to *his own* power ; and all the evidence which I bring shall be drawn solely from public, authoritative documents which I pledge myself to have examined.

I. First, then, let me call your attention to the statements in the Pope's *Laws* concerning his own *temporal* power. You know full well, that Pius IV. affirms that Almighty God* inspired the Council of Trent to require that Oath to be taken, which is now imposed on all Romish ecclesiastics, regular and secular, in Great Britain and Ireland as well as in France: and you are aware also, that in this oath they swear to receive without doubting, all things delivered, defined, and declared in the *Canon Law*†; and you

* In his Bull, "*Injunctum nobis,*" 13th Nov. 1564. Bullarium Romanum, tom. vii. p. 204, ed. Rom. 1745. The words are : "Dominus Omnipotens ad providam Ecclesiæ directionem sanctis Patribus (Tridentinis) in nomine suo congregatis divinitus inspirare dignatus est."

† "Omnia a Sacris Canonibus et Œcumenicis Conciliis ac præcipue

know that the Canon Law contains the edicts of the Popes; that it is printed under their sanction; and that they command all to receive and obey it.

In the edition of the Canon Law now before me, which was printed *only seven years ago*, with the approval of the Roman Catholic consistory of Saxony, I find it asserted by Popes of Rome, that "the kingly power is subject to the pontifical; that the Pope has a right to depose sovereigns, to dispose of their kingdoms, and to absolve subjects from their allegiance; that all oaths to the prejudice of the Church of Rome are null and void; and that Romish ecclesiastics may resist their sovereigns for the good of their Church, and even for their own private advantage*."

a Sacrosanctâ Tridentinâ Synodo tradita, definita, et declarata, indubitanter recipio atque profiteor."—Ibid. p. 204.

* I annex a literal version of the Pope's assertions concerning his own powers, in his own Canon Laws, published by his own *order* (*jussu*), from the last complete edition, S. Reverendi Consistorii Catholici per regnum Saxoniæ approbatione, Lipsiæ, 1839 :—

On Oaths of Allegiance.

"The Apostolic authority altogether cancels illicit Oaths . . . as the Lord says by the Prophet (Isaiah lviii. 6), Dissolve colligationes impietatis."

"The Roman Pontiff absolves from the Oath of Allegiance, when he *deposes* any from their dignity."—Decret. II. Pars. C. xv. Q. vi. p. 647.

Deposition of Sovereigns. Oaths of Subjects and Soldiers. (*Ibid.* p. 648.)

"The Pontifical authority absolves from the Oath of Allegiance." (The following ancient precedent is then cited,) "The Roman Pontiff, Zachariah †, *deposed* the king of the Franks, not so much for his evil

† Pope Zachariah died A.D. 752, and was canonized.

Such, Sir, are the assertions which the Pope makes concerning his own powers in his own Laws,

deeds, as because he was not serviceable to his own power; and raised to the throne, in his place, Pepin, the father of Charlemagne, and absolved all the Franks from the oath of allegiance which they had taken."

"The same is done *frequently* (*auctoritate frequenti*) by the Holy Church, when it releases *soldiers* from the obligation of their oaths."

Oaths of Allegiance to excommunicate persons are void. (*Ibid.* p. 648.)

"No one owes allegiance to any excommunicate persons before they are reconciled to the Holy See." The Pope proceeds to *forbid* such allegiance to be paid. *Ibid.* "Juratos milites ne ipsi, quamdiu excommunicatus fuerit, serviant, *prohibeto.*"

"No oaths are to be kept if they are against the interest of the Church of Rome."

"Oaths which are against the interests of the Church, are not to be called oaths, but perjuries." Decret. Greg. IX. lib. ii. tit. xxiv. cap. 27. (vol. ii. p. 358.)

The Pope orders, "Si præstitum juramentum ei, quod a te *nobis* tanquam debitum est præstandum, *contrarium* reputes, illud illicitum judicabis." *Ibid.* p. 355.

Oaths of Allegiance taken by *Ecclesiastics* to temporal Sovereigns are *illicit* and *void*.

"Ecclesiastics not having temporalities from laics, are not bound to take oaths of allegiance to them. Certain laics strive to usurp too much on the Divine right, when they compel Ecclesiastics, receiving no temporalities from them, to take oaths of allegiance; but since, according to the Apostle (Rom. xiv. 4), every one stands or falls to *his own Master*, we prohibit such Ecclesiastics from any such violence." Decret. Greg. IX. lib. ii. tit. xxiv. cap. 30, p. 350.

"We declare that you are not bound by your oath of allegiance to your Prince; but that you may resist freely even your Prince himself, in defence of the rights and honours of the Church, and even of your own private advantage." *Ibid.* cap. 31, p. 360. (To Ecclesiastics.)

"The Kingly power is subject to the Pontifical, and is bound to obey it." Decret. Greg. IX. lib. i. tit. xxxiii. cap. 6. (vol. ii. p. 190.)

[The

and which he publishes to the world, and requires to be received, and which he imposes by a solemn *oath* on Romish ecclesiastics: and all these asseverations, observe, concern *temporal* affairs. Any one therefore

The whole of this chapter is very strong and clear on this subject. It is observable, also, that it is addressed to a crowned head:

"Potuisses prærogativam sacerdotii ex eo potius intelligere quod datum est non regi sed sacerdoti, '*Ecce constitui te super gentes et regna, ut evellas et dissipes, ædifices ac plantes*' (Jerem. i. 10) . . . et *fecit et Deus duo luminaria* (Gen. i. 16); sed illa quæ præest *diebus*, id est *Spiritualibus*, major est, ea verò quæ *noctibus*, id est *carnalibus*, minor; ut quanta est inter solem et lunam, tanta inter Pontifices et Reges differentia cognoscatur."

"We declare, affirm, and define, that *submission to the Roman Pontiff is universally necessary to salvation.*" (Omni humanæ creaturæ omninò de necessitate salutis.) "Whoever resists this power, resists the ordinance of God." (See this enlarged upon in this chapter. Extrav. Commun. lib. i. tit. viii. vol. ii. p. 1159.)

"Heretics and Schismatics are excommunicated; and all who were bound to them are released from their obligations." Decret. Greg. IX. lib. v. tit. vii. cap. 16.)

In the XVI. Canon of the third Council of Lateran, it is affirmed that those oaths are not to be called oaths, but perjuries rather, which are contrary to the advantage of the Church. Bp. DOYLE says (Appendix to Irish Education Report, p. 794), "The third Lateran Council is one of the General Councils of the Roman Catholic Church." . . . In the 27th chapter of that Council it is affirmed, that all who are in any way bound to heretics, should consider themselves absolved from all fidelity and obedience due to them as long as they persist in their iniquity.

Archbp. MURRAY (ibid.) admitted that the Council of Constance was general, and Roman Catholics profess that they receive without doubt what the Canons of the General Councils declare; and one of the decrees of the Council of Constance is, that "faith is not to be kept with heretics, to the prejudice of the Church." Session 19.

In 1626, May 30, Urban VIII. published his Bull declaring the Oath of Allegiance proposed by King James I. of England to be unlawful, "as tending to wrest the sceptre of the Universal Church from the hands of the *Vicar of Almighty God.*"

who would deny that the Pope claims *Secular supremacy*, would accuse him, not only of falsehood, but of publicly forcing it on the world.

II. But, secondly, these you may say are, it is true, assertions of temporal supremacy; but, you may add, let us see it put in *practice* by him, in order that we may believe that it is claimed. On this objection, however, you would not, I am sure, lay much stress, inasmuch as it is clear that, since the *exercise* of the power depends upon circumstances over which the *Pope* has *no control*, the *assertion* of it alone is a sufficient proof of his belief in its existence, and of his determination to exercise it whenever he is able to do so.

Still further, however, I will now show that the authority in question *has* been exercised by him continually *de facto* from the eleventh century to *our own age*, whenever no such controlling circumstances were in existence; and it would be preposterous, therefore, to say that claims put forward in this solemn manner, which we have seen these to be, are not most serious assertions. Let me remind you also that this authority has not only been exercised, but that the *records* of its exercise have been published at Rome, under Papal sanction, in an uninterrupted series up to the present time.

Before me is an edition of the *Bullarium Romanum*, printed at Rome, "*facultate et privilegio sanctissimi**."

* In thirty volumes, folio, Romæ, A.D. 1739—1762.

In it I find the bull by which Gregory VII., Hildebrand, deposed the Emperor, Henry the Fourth, and absolved his subjects from their allegiance*. I see the same act repeated in another document in the same collection†. Passing over the bulls in which Pope Gregory IX. excommunicated the Emperor, Frederick II.‡, and in which Pope Innocent IV. deposed the same sovereign§, I see there the bull in which Paul III.‖, in 1535, excommunicated King Henry the Eighth of England, and ordered his nobles to rebel against him: I proceed further, and find another similar document, in which Pius V.¶ (now *canonized as a saint* by the Church of Rome) pretended to depose Queen Elizabeth, and to deprive her of what he called "*prætenso regni jure*," and to declare her subjects "for ever absolved from any oath, and all manner of duty, allegiance, and obedience to her;" and commanded them, on pain of excommunication, "not to presume to obey her monitions, mandates, and laws." In the year 1640**, Paul V., and in 1671††, Clement X., anathematized all Protestant princes and subjects as heretics, who by the Papal laws are not only incapable of possessing any civil power or rights, but are amenable to temporal penalties, and even to death‡‡.

* Vol. ii. p. 35. A.D. 1075.
† Vol. ii. p. 53. A.D. 1080.
‡ Vol. iii. p. 291. A.D. 1239.
§ Vol. iii. p. 300. A.D. 1245.
‖ Vol. vi. p. 129.
¶ Vol. vii. p. 99.
** Vol. v. p. 319.
†† Vol. xxi. p. 95.
‡‡ Decret. Caus. xxiii. Qu. v. c. 47. Decretal. v. tit. vii. cap. x. xiv.

And to come now to later times, and to your own history. In the year 1801, Pope Pius VII., as you know, made a *Concordat* with Napoleon, then First Consul, for regulating the affairs of your Church. On the 24th of August, 1801, he, as head of the Church of Rome, published a bull *, in which he agreed that all the bishops and clergy of France should take an oath of allegiance to the *Republic*, and he declared that he recognized the Republic and First Consul as possessing all the rights and privileges of the *ancient dynasty* †.

In another bull, dated 29th November, 1801 ‡, he deprived about a hundred bishops of their sees, to which they had been appointed by the king of France. Nor was this all; in further confirmation of these acts of his deposing power, he went from Rome to Paris, where he crowned Napoleon Emperor of the French on the 2nd December, Advent Sunday, 1804 §.

I have shown that the Pope requires all his ecclesiastics to swear obedience to his Canon Law, and that in that law it is declared that he has the power of deposing kings, and of absolving subjects from

* Beginning with the words, *Ecclesia Christi.* See *Bulles du Pape Pie VII. et autres pièces relatives au Concordat*, published at London, 1802, p. 25, where this, and the other documents mentioned in the text, is printed.

† Ibid. p. 33.

‡ Beginning with the words, *Qui Christi Domini vices.*

§ See his Allocution to the Consistory of Cardinals, June 26, 1805, beginning *Ab illo usque.*

their allegiance; and I would beg you to observe, that by these bulls, to which I have just referred, the Pope not only *did* absolve all French Roman Catholics from their allegiance to their rightful sovereign, Louis XVIII., whom he himself had acknowledged* as such a few months before, but he bound them by virtue of their oaths to himself to *take* an *oath* of *allegiance* to *an usurper*, (one who, in a proclamation published in Egypt, had a short time before declared himself to be a *sectateur de Mahomet*†,) and that the Pope not only indirectly deprived Louis XVIII. of his crown, but that he *placed it* with *his own* hands *on the head of Napoleon*.

You may say that he exercised this absolving and depriving power (for such, in fact, it was) for the benefit of the Church, and the re-establishment of religion. Yes, I reply; so, no doubt, according to their own notions, did Paul III. and Pius V., when they deposed King Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth; so did Gregory XIII. and Sixtus V., when they reiterated the sentence against Elizabeth; so did Paul ‡ and Urban VIII. §, when they forbade

* Ce Pape, par une lettre du 14 Mars, 1800, avait reconnu Louis XVIII. pour Roi légitime de France, il lui fait part de la nouvelle de son élection, il lui témoigne une prédilection particulière, il l'appelle Sa Majesté Très-Chrétienne, et la lettre a pour inscription, Carissimo in Christo filio nostro Ludovico XVIII., Regi Christianissimo. See L'Etat Politique et Religieux de la France, &c. Lond. 1806. The original letter may be seen in the Réclamations of the French bishops to Pius VII. Lond. 1805, p. 10.

† Ibid. p. 68. ‡ In 1606. § In 1626.

English Roman Catholics to take the oath of allegiance to King James I. and Charles I.; and so *will* any *future Pope*, who may pretend to give a kingdom away from its lawful Sovereign to a military Rebel, a factious Demagogue, or a regicidal Republic.

Perhaps, also, it may be alleged, that Pius VII. did not dare to resist Napoleon's will; that he acted from necessity. This is a very humiliating avowal in behalf of the so-called vicar of Christ. He had not the spirit of a martyr! But observe, Sir, the *facts* of the case. In 1804, Napoleon usurps the dominions of Louis XVIII., and Pius VII. crowns him. But in 1809, the same Napoleon invades the Pope's own territory, and the same Pope excommunicates him *! On the whole, then, I adopt the language of Dr. O'Connor, one of the most learned of the Irish Romanists of our own age, who says, that by those bulls (of which I have just spoken), "Pope Pius VII. absolved all Frenchmen from their oaths of allegiance to the Bourbons, expressly alienating not only the crown of France, but also the properties of all French loyalists, secular and ecclesiastical, and hurling down from their sees above a hundred bishops, who were guilty of no other crime than that of fidelity to their prince †."

* In his Lettere Apostoliche in forma di Breve colle quali si dichiarano scommunicati e di nuovo si scommunicano gli Esecutori ed i Fautori della Usurpazione del Dominio di Roma e degli altri Stati appartenenti alla S. Sede.—Decimo di Giugno, 1809.

† Columbanus, ii. pp. 5. 16; see also p. 26, "Our" (Irish Roman-

III. But, thirdly, *if* a Christian Church is ever insincere, it cannot, I suppose, be in her *prayers;* she must be in earnest *there:* and we should be guilty of great uncharitableness towards the Church of Rome if we believed it possible that she could play the hypocrite in her spiritual communion with the omniscient Searcher of hearts. Let us turn then to her public Liturgy—her *Breviary.* Before me is a very recent edition, one of 1840, printed at Ratisbonne; I refer to the Calendar prefixed to it, for the month of May. The fifth of that month is a double festival in honour of Pope Pius, the fifth of that name, the pope who pretended to depose our Queen Elizabeth and to order all her subjects to rise up in rebellion against her on pain of excommunication. He is now *worshipped as a saint* by the Church of Rome, and is associated with apostles and evangelists of Christ. I proceed a little further, and find the twenty-fifth of the same month is also marked in the Calendar as a double festival, with a commemoration service in honour of Pope Gregory VII., Hildebrand, who, as

ist) "bishops must unequivocally renounce those maxims of ultramontanism which have caused so many calamities to Ireland. They must recall their own acts in the Synod of Tullagh, by which they have sanctioned the Pope's power to crown one king and uncrown another, and by which they have approved of his indirectly absolving the French from their allegiance to the successor of one hundred kings."—This work deserves special attention in these times. It has unfortunately now become exceedingly scarce. The present archbishop of Paris has also recognized in these Bulls of Pius VII. an exercise of the deposing power. See his *De l'appel comme d'abus,* p. 293. Paris, 1843.

we have seen, deposed the emperor, Henry IV. He also is now adored among the *saints* of the Romish Church. Certain Collects, as you know, are appointed to be said in the Romish Churches on these two festivals. That for St. Pius's day is as follows * :—

"O God, Who for *crushing* the *enemies* of Thy Church, and for the reparation of Divine worship, didst deign to choose blessed Pius as Pope, grant that we may be defended by his protection, and may so follow Thy commands, that we may *vanquish the treachery of all our enemies,* and rejoice with Thee in everlasting peace, through our Lord."

There are certain Lessons appointed to be read in the Roman Church on this day, which are not taken from Holy Scripture, nor from the Fathers, but have been composed expressly for this festival. In one of these Lessons (as it stands in p. 662 of the Paris edition of 1842, of the Breviary), we find that Pius is extolled for having "long discharged the office of *Inquisitor* with inflexible fortitude," and for having "displayed invincible courage in asserting *the rights of the apostolic see.*"

Can it be said that the deposition of sovereigns and the torture of heretics is not now approved by the Church of Rome, when Pius V., the dethroner of Elizabeth, the unrelenting Inquisitor, is lauded at this day in these terms in the Prayer Book of Rome?

* Breviarium Romanum, Ratisbonæ, 1840.

The Collect for Pope Gregory VIIth's day runs thus:—

"O God, the strength of those that hope in Thee, who didst endue blessed Gregory, Thy confessor and priest, with the virtue of constancy, for the *maintenance of the liberty of the Church*, grant to us boldly to *overcome all opposition* by *his example* and *intercession*, through the Lord."

But this is not all: in the year 1728, Pope Benedict XIII. appointed certain proper Lessons (like those for Pius Vth's day) to be read in all Romish Churches on Gregory VIIth's festival. The second of these Lessons contains the following words * :—

"He (St. Gregory) stood like a fearless wrestler (athleta impavidus) *against the impious attempts* of Henry the Emperor, and *deprived him of the communion of the faithful* and of *his crown*, and *released all his subjects from their allegiance to him*—(subditos populos fide ei datâ liberavit)."

It was long since observed by Don Nicola Fraggiani, Secretary of State for the kingdom of Naples, in a letter to the Emperor, Charles VI. †, "that all

* The original is as follows :—"Contra Henrici Imperatoris impios conatus fortis per omnia athleta impavidus permansit, seque pro muro domui Israël ponere non timuit, ac eundem Henricum in profundum malorum prolapsum fidelium communione regnoque privavit, atque subditos populos fide ei datâ liberavit."

† Copia da Consulta de Nicola Fraggiani, Segretario de Reyno de Napoles, &c. Lisboa, 1768.

those who read this Lesson would naturally think, that to depose an Emperor, and to absolve his subjects from their allegiance, was an unquestionable right belonging to the popes; and that it was a *glorious and divine thing* on the part of Pope Gregory to have done these two deeds, since the Church," which has canonized him, "makes it a subject of commemoration in *the religious service*" wherein she *honours him as ranked among the saints.*

This is so clear, that even Roman Catholic sovereigns * have interfered to *prohibit* the printing of this Second Lesson in Breviaries published in their dominions, and therefore it is not found in *all* editions; but as far as the Roman *Pontiffs* are concerned, it is read *in every church* at this day; and although neither the Lessons of Gregory, nor the Collects above mentioned, nor any notice of these two festivals is to be found in a French Breviary (which I have before me) of the year 1746 †, yet not only the Festivals and the Collects have *now* been brought again into the Breviary, but *that* very Lesson, in which Gregory is lauded as a saint and a dauntless cham-

* As, for instance, Charles VI. and the kings of France. I have a Breviary, printed at Amiens in 1746, before me, which has been so carefully revised by the civil power, that neither the Lesson for Gregory's day, nor the Collects for his festival, or for that of Pius V., are to be found in it, nor are their days even marked as festivals at all; but both of them stand in the Irish and English Roman Catholic Directories of this present year.

† See preceding note.

pion of the Church, because he dethroned Henry IV., and released his subjects from their allegiance, and which was *suppressed* by the Parliament of France on the 22nd July, 1729 *, has *now* found its way into the Paris and Lyons edition of the *Roman Breviary*, of the year 1842, where it stands in p. 676 †. Such are the doctrines which the Church of Rome *now* preaches on her religious festivals in the Churches of France ‡ ! With her, the acts of Pius and of Gregory are as fresh as if they were done yesterday § ; and is it too much to say, that by eulo-

* See the life of P. Gilbert de Voisins, Biblioth. Univ. xvii. 363.

† This Lesson has also found its way again into the Breviaries of Belgium. See the Mechlin edition, 1843, p. 325.

‡ This Lesson is prohibited in *Austria ;* against which the French ultramontane press speaks in the following terms (Univers, Jan. 14, 1847):—"Notre correspondant de Prague, faisant un tableau des œuvres du Joséphisme [1], qui est le gallicanisme de l'Autriche, rappelait, *entre autres brutalités, la défense d'insérer l'office* de saint Grégoire VII. dans les livres imprimés à l'usage *du clergé autrichien.* 'Ainsi,' disait-il, 'voilà un saint rayé du bréviaire par ce gouvernement catholique, apostolique et romain.' Cette phrase irrita extrêmement la *Gazette* (de France), non contre le gouvernement autrichien, non contre le Joséphisme, mais contre nous. Elle s'écria là-dessus, que l'*Univers* était certainement 'le *plus grand ennemi* du *clergé de France* et l'*adversaire le plus déclaré de la liberté d'enseignement :*' car, 'comment veut-on qu'un *Etat livre des Enfants* à l'enseignement d'hommes qui diraient ce qu'écrit l'*Univers* ? Il n'y aurait pas sur la tête d'un roi une couronne qui ne fût en péril si GRÉGOIRE VII. *est un saint.*'"

§ It ought to be known and borne in mind what the principles are with which the Church of Rome has identified and still identifies herself by the canonization and veneration of Gregory VII. I there-

[1] So called by ultamontans, from the Emperor Joseph II. of Austria.

gizing them in her liturgy she shows her desire that they may be *repeated?*

fore transcribe that Pope's own statement of them, from the great work of Cardinal Baronius, Annales Eccles. tom. xi. p. 632, Col. 1609, ad A.D. 1076.

" Ad hanc quoque synodum spectare noscuntur, quæ superiori libro positæ leguntur *ejusdem Gregorii Papæ sententiæ breviores*, quæ hoc titulo inscriptæ habentur 'DICTATUS PAPÆ.'

" *Quod Romana Ecclesia a solo Domino sit fundata.*

" *Quod solus Romanus Pontifex jure dicatur universalis.*

" *Quod ille solus possit deponere Episcopos vel reconciliare.*

" *Quod legatus ejus omnibus Episcopis præsit in Concilio, etiam inferioris gradus, et adversus eos sententiam depositionis possit dare.*

" *Quod cum excommunicatis ab illo inter cetera nec in eadem domo debemus permanere.*

" *Quod illi soli licet pro temporis necessitate novas leges condere, novas plebes congregare, de canonica Abbatiam facere, et è contra divitem Episcopatum dividere, et inopes unire.*

" *Quod solus possit uti Imperialibus insigniis.*

" *Quod solius Papæ pedes omnes Principes deosculentur.*

" *Quod illius solius nomen in Ecclesiis recitetur.*

" *Quod unicum est nomen in mundo, Papæ videlicet.*

" *Quod illi liceat Imperatores deponere.*

" *Quod illi liceat de sede ad sedem necessitate cogente Episcopos transmutare.*

" *Quod de omni Ecclesia quâcunque voluerit clericum valeat ordinare.*

" *Quod ab illo ordinatus alii Ecclesiæ præesse potest, sed non militare, et quod ab aliquo Episcopo non debet superiorem gradum accipere.*

" *Quod nulla Synodus absque præcepto ejus debet Generalis vocari.*

" *Quod nullum Capitulum, nullusque liber canonicus habeatur absque illius auctoritate.*

" *Quod sententia illius à nullo debeat retractari; et ipse omnium solus retractare possit.*

" *Quod à nemine ipse judicari debeat.*

" *Quod nullus audeat condemnare Apostolicam sedem appellantem.*

" *Quod majores causæ cujuscunque Ecclesiæ ad eum referri debeant.*

" *Quod Romana Ecclesia nunquam erravit nec in perpetuum, Scriptura testante, errabit.*

" *Quod Romanus Pontifex si canonicè fuerit ordinatus, meritis beati*

The bull *in Cœnâ Domini*, which is so called, because it is ordered to be read annually in every Romish Church on Maundy Thursday, the day on which our Blessed Lord instituted His Sacramental Supper, consists, you are aware, of a long series of imprecations, (many of which are due to Pius V.) renewed by above *twenty different popes*, against all Protestants, princes, parliaments, and people, whom it anathematizes as heretics, and, as heretics, incapable, by the papal law, not only of enjoying civil power and rights, but, as I have before said, liable to temporal penalties, and even to death*. In the year 1688, your parliament at Paris affirmed, that by this bull the popes declare themselves sovereigns of the world†. And Cardinal Erskine, auditor of the late Pius VI., and "Promoter of the faith," in a letter to Sir J. C. Hippisley, (August, 1793,) confessed that "although the form-

Petri indubitanter efficitur sanctus, testante Sancto Ennodio Papiensi Episcopo, ei multis sanctis Patribus faventibus, sicut in decretis beati Symmachi Papæ continetur.

"*Quod illius præcepto et licentia subjectis liceat accusare.*

"*Quod absque synodali conventu possit Episcopos deponere et reconciliare.*

"*Quod Catholicus non habeatur, qui non concordat Romanæ Ecclesiæ.*

"*Quod a fidelitate iniquorum subjectos potest absolvere.* Hactenus Gregorius de privilegiis Romani Pontificis atque Apostolicæ sedis."

* Decret. Caus. xxiii. Qu. v. c. 47. Decretal. v. tit. vii. cap. x—xiv. "Non sunt homicidæ qui adversus excommunicatos zelo matris Ecclesiæ armantur."

† See the "Proceedings of the Parliament of Paris upon the Pope's Bull, &c. London, 1688." Printed in the Appendix to Leslie's Case Stated, 5th edition, 1714.

ality of *its publication* at Rome is now omitted out of a compliment to some princes, to whom some parts of the said bull are obnoxious, *yet it is implicitly in vigour in all its extension,* and is likewise observed in all cases where *there is no impediment to the exertion of the pope's authority**."

As far, then, as regards the pope, this bull, which anathematizes all Protestants, is recited every year in the course of Divine Service in all Roman Catholic Churches: "it is implicitly in *vigour* in *all its extension.*"

IV. And fourthly, one of the most solemn acts of Divine worship is an Oath. When we impose one on others, or take an oath ourselves, we acknowledge and adore God's omniscience, we appeal to Him as knowing the secrets of all hearts, we confess Him as the just and Almighty Governor of all the world, as the future Judge of all men, and as the great Avenger of all violations of truth and equity. And if any one Oath can be said to be more sacred than another, surely it is that which a Christian Church requires to be taken by her ministers at the time of their *ordination.* Here, I say, we may justly expect that every word will be scrupulously weighed; every syllable will be uttered with seriousness and awe. There is scarcely any sin of which we would not believe it possible for a Church to be guilty, rather

* See Appendix to Report from Committee on the Regulation of Roman Catholics in Foreign Countries, p. 341, Lond. 1816.

than that of dictating a falsehood in the oaths which she imposes on her ministers at their inauguration in their sacred office.

Not now to speak of the Oath, commonly called the oath of Pius IV.*, which the Church of Rome requires to be taken by *all* her ecclesiastics, secular and regular, by which they are bound to give "true obedience to the Roman Pontiff, the successor of St. Peter and Vicar of Jesus Christ," let us see what the Pope requires from his *Bishops*. I refer to an edition of the Roman *Pontifical*, printed at Rome *by authority* in the year 1818, and in page 62 of that volume I find the form of the oath to be taken by *every* Roman Catholic bishop at his consecration.

In it he swears to "be faithful and obedient to his Lord the Pope (the reigning Pope's name being inserted) and his successors; to assist them in maintaining the *Roman papacy and the royalties of St. Peter against all men;* to preserve, defend, augment, and promote its rights, honours, and privileges; to *persecute and impugn, with all his might, heretics and schismatics, and rebels against his said Lord*†; to

* See above, p. 278. Jus Canonicum, p. 111.

† This clause, "to persecute," down to "said lord," is in some countries dispensed with in practice, because it is prohibited by the civil power; but its retention in the *Roman* edition of the Pontifical, ed. 1818, to which I refer in the text, is a strong proof that in this and similar dispensations Rome does in fact *retract nothing*; and that, the prohibition being removed, or the civil power becoming unable to

come, when summoned to a Roman Council; to visit the threshold of the Apostles (*i. e.* the city of Rome) once in every three years; to render an account to his Lord the Pope of all the state of his diocese, and to receive his Apostolic mandates with humility; and if he is unable, through any lawful impediment, to attend in person, to provide a sufficient deputy in his stead."

When a Roman Catholic bishop is promoted to an *archbishopric*, he *again* takes this oath before he can execute any function of his office even as a bishop*. His episcopal authority is, in fact, merged in the papacy, from which it is again to be derived. Here then, my dear Sir, we have a declaration from the Church of Rome of her own claims, made in the most formal manner, and continually repeated on the most solemn occasions. That man, I think, must have a very low opinion indeed of her honesty, who, especially when he construes this oath with her laws, her bulls, her canonizations, her collects, her proper lessons, and her festivals, can do otherwise than regard it as a most solemn and explicit assertion of *temporal* supremacy on her part.

I am aware that in various countries, as, for instance, in France and England, the civil power has thought fit to require this oath to be accompanied

enforce it, all the claims of the papacy will revive with *more* than all their original force.

* Pontificale, pp. 86, 87.

with a reserving clause in favour of its own rights; but it is clear that by so doing it does not weaken the force of the obligation, which is imposed by the oath, to the pope, but it makes *bad worse;* it only binds it more strongly on the consciences of those who take it. For by *adding* this clause to the oath, the civil power shows that it is aware of the imposition of the oath; it treats it as a legal oath, not as one to be *abjured*, as it ought to require it to be;* and the State cannot be supposed by those who take the oath to be ignorant of the fact, (for, as I have already shown above, p. 280, the pope has publicly declared it in his canon law, which he requires to be universally received,) that all oaths, and, much more, all clauses of oaths, to the detriment of the papal authority, *are utterly null and void;* and if the civil power *is* ignorant of this fact, the blame lies with itself, and it must take the consequences—"si vult decipi, *decipiatur.*"

Is it not clear therefore that the true course to be taken by the Civil Power is to *prohibit* altogether the taking of the Roman Catholic Bishop's and Priest's Oath by any of its subjects, as inconsistent with and destructive of the *natural* and indefeasible† obligation of civil *allegiance?* By *Divine right* the

* As the Solemn League and Covenant was required to be, "as an unlawful oath, imposed on the subjects of this realm against the known laws and liberties of this kingdom," 13 and 14 Car. II. cap. 4.

† See the words of Bp. Sanderson, below, Letter xiii. p. 345.

Governing Power is entitled to the *whole man:* and *if* any of its subjects give away the greater half of themselves to the Pope, they so far cease to be *subjects*, they have *outlawed themselves*, and by their own act they *compel* the State, in the discharge of its duty to itself and to all loyal subjects, to treat them as *aliens* and not as *citizens;* as wittingly and wilfully subjects of *Rome*, and not of England or France.

I must further observe here, that the Trent Oath is imposed by the Pope, not only on all *ecclesiastics*, regular and secular, but on all *Professors* in *Colleges*, and on all *Teachers* in *Schools*;* and that no *academic degree* can be conferred in a Romanist College, unless the graduating person takes the Tridentine Oath. Thus Rome claims to herself *Educational* supremacy, as well as *Ecclesiastical* and *Civil*, over the whole world.

V. Fifthly, We have seen what declarations are required by the Pope from Roman Catholic Bishops and Priests at their Consecration and Ordination; let us now consider what *public demonstrations* he makes of his own claims, when he is inaugurated in the Pontificate. This is a most important inquiry, and leads to most striking results.

In an official Directory concerning the Election of a Pope will be found the following clause; I quote from the "Notitia Congregationum et Tribunalium

* See Bull of Pius IV. *In Sacrosancta.* Streitwolf, ii. p. 317.

Curiæ Romanæ*," that is, from the Standing Orders of the Court of Rome.

"After his election and proclamation, the Pope, attired in the Pontifical dress†, is borne on the Pontifical chair, to the *Church* of St. Peter, and is placed *upon* the *High Altar*, where he is saluted for the third time by the Cardinals, kissing his feet, hands, and mouth. In the mean time the *Te Deum* is sung; and, when the *adoration* and the hymn is over, the Dean of the Sacred College chants some versicles and a prayer, then the Pontiff *descends from the Altar*, and is carried to the Vatican; and after some days he is crowned in the Church of St. Peter by the senior Cardinal Deacon."

Such, Sir, is the inauguration of a Pope. Let us observe, this ceremony takes place in the principal Church of Rome. The newly elected Pontiff is borne on men's shoulders, and is placed on the high altar

* Edited, from authentic sources, (see Præfat. ad fin.) by H. Lettenburg, a Jesuit, and dedicated to a Bishop of Paderborn, Hildesii, 1683.

† The words of the original are as follows, p. 125 :—"Revertuntur Cardinales ad Capellam (Paulinam) et secundam faciunt salutationem seu *adorationem* Papæ habitu Pontificali induto. Quâ finitâ . . . portatur *in sede Pontificali* ad *S. Petrum, poniturque suprà altare majus*, ubi tertiâ vice salutatur osculo pedis, manus, et oris, modo supradicto, a Cardinalibus. Interim cantatur a musicis Hymnus Ambrosianus; peractâ *adoratione* et finito Hymno cantat S. Collegii Decanus Versiculos quosdam et Orationem : deinde *descendit Pontifex ex altari* . . . et portatur ad Palatium Vaticanum. Post aliquot dies coronatur Pontifex in Basilicâ S. Petri ab antiquiore Diacono Cardinali."

of that Church! He sits upon it; the high altar is his footstool; and, there enthroned as a King, he is *adored* as a God by the Cardinals, the Princes of the Roman Church, who kiss the feet which profanely trample on the altar of the Most High!

What is this but an assumption of Omnipotence? Is it not even an arrogation of power greater than Divine? I would speak with reverential fear on so awful a subject, but I must confess that in contemplating this public inauguration of the Roman Pontiff, I cannot divest myself of the conviction that he is *then* identifying himself with the Spiritual Usurper, who, St. Paul predicted, would be revealed, "the Man of Sin, the Son of Perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, so that he, as God, *sitteth* in the *temple of God*, showing himself that he is God*."

Some time has elapsed since I first read the passage to which I have referred in the Order for the Election of a Pope, and I was desirous of ascertaining whether the practice there described would

* καθίσαι εἰς τὸν ναόν. It is observable that ναὸς is the holier part (such as the altar) of a Temple (ἱερὸν) and that καθίσαι εἰς, with the accusative, is very proper to describe an *apportatio ad, et collocatio in*, the ναός. . . . The main characteristic of the Papacy, as I have shown in these letters, is *destructiveness* and *desolation* of *things sacred:* and thus it seems to appropriate to itself the name βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως: and when we behold the Roman Pontiff sitting and standing on God's altar, we are almost compelled to ask,—Is not this the βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως ἑστὼς ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ . . ἑστὼς ὅπου οὐ δεῖ, spoken of by our Blessed Lord? Matt. xxiv. 15. Mark xiii. 14.

be observed in the election of the *present* Pope ; and you will believe me, I trust, when I say that it was with very painful feelings that I perused the following description of that ceremony given in your leading Romanist Journal*.

"*Première entrée du Pape au Vatican.*

"C'est le 17 juin (1846), vers cinq heures et demie, que Sa Sainteté Pie IX. s'est rendu à Saint-Pierre pour y recevoir la seconde et la troisième *adoration* des cardinaux."

"Lorsque le Conclave avait lieu au Vatican, le nouveau Pontife se rendait à la chapelle Sixtine, pour y recevoir la *seconde adoration*, dès que les portes du Conclave étaient ouvertes. Depuis que l'élection se fait au Quirinal, le Pape n'est ordinairement conduit au palais de Saint-Pierre que le lendemain. Il en a été ainsi pour Pie VIII. et Grégoire XVI. ; il en a été ainsi pour Pie IX."

"Arrivé dans la petite salle des parements, *de' paramenti*, le Pape prend la mitre d'or et la chape d'argent, entre dans la chapelle Sixtine, prie, s'asseoit sur le coussin préparé au milieu de l'autel, où il reçoit la deuxième *adoration* des Cardinaux, qui baisent ses pieds, sa main, sous la frange de la chape, et reçoivent de lui le double baiser."

"Sa Sainteté, élevée sur la *sedia*, précédée de la croix et des chantres de la chapelle papale, qui

* *Univers*, 27 Juin, 1846.

chantent l'*Ecce sacerdos magnus,* entourée des gardes suisses, escortée de tous les prélats et dignitaires de sa maison et de la cour pontificale, est portée *à la basilique,* (*i. e.* the Church of St. Peter,) à travers la salle royale et par l'escalier royal, et reçue par le Chapitre, sous le portique, au chant de l'antienne, *Tu es Petrus.* Le Saint-Père descend de la *sedia* devant l'autel du Saint-Sacrement, s'agenouille et prie. On le porte ensuite devant l'autel de la chaire de Saint-Pierre qui fait face au grand autel de la confession. Le Pape descend de nouveau, et de nouveau s'agenouille et prie. Puis, *assis au milieu de cet autel,* il reçoit la troisième *adoration* des Cardinaux, qui la rendent, la barrette à la main et le manteau traînant. Le Cardinal Doyen ayant, le premier, fait son obédience, entonne le *Te Deum,* que les chantres continuent jusqu'à ce que le Pape ait *reçu l'adoration de tout le Sacré Collége.* Alors le cardinal entonne le *Pater Noster,* le verset *Salvum fac servum tuum,* avec les versets ordinaires ; le chœur répond, et le Pontife, sans mitre, *assis sur l'autel,* commence le verset, *Sit nomen Domini benedictum ;* puis, *debout* la tête inclinée, il bénit solennellement, pour la première fois, le peuple dont les flots inondent la basilique."

Such, Sir, was the Spectacle presented by the Church of St. Peter on the 17th of last June. Let me now say a word on the *Coronation* of the Pontiff.

The form of words used by the Cardinal Deacon

when he places the triple crown on the head of the Pope, seated, as it were, between heaven and earth, on the lofty balcony in the portico of St. Peter's, looking down on the crowds in the piazza before it, have been cited by our Theologians *, as proving incontrovertibly that the Roman Pontiff *claims* Universal Supremacy, temporal as well as spiritual. "Know that thou art Father of Princes and of Kings, and RULER of the WORLD;" these are the expressions with which he is then addressed when he is invested with his dignities as a sovereign. It cannot be said that he has ever laid aside these claims: they were asserted in a solemn manner in the presence of thousands on Sunday the 21st of June last year. I quote the following description of the ceremony of the coronation of the present Pope from the same source † as that from which the account of his inauguration in St. Peter's is derived. The scene changes from the interior of that Church to its exterior; from the High Altar to the Grand Balcony in the Eastern Façade of it.

"*Couronnement du Souverain-Pontife.*

"C'est le dimanche 21 juin, fête de saint Louis de Gonzague ‡, qu'a eu lieu, dans la basilique de Saint-Pierre, le *couronnement* de notre Saint-Père le Pape

* Leslie, Case Stated, p. 75. Townson's Works, ii. p. 252.

† *Univers*, 1 Juillet, 1846.

‡ One of the principal Patron Saints of the Order of Jesuits.

Pie IX. Voici quelques détails sur cette magnifique et sainte cérémonie :

" Le couronnement a lieu d'ordinaire un dimanche (le dimanche qui suit l'élection), ou un jour de fête ; cependant, cette règle ne fut pas toujours observée ; Léon X. fut couronné le samedi, Clément VIII. le jeudi, Paul II. le mardi, etc. C'est à Saint-Pierre, et depuis Marcel II. (en 1555), dans la Grande-Loge (balcon) de la basilique, que le Pape est couronné.

* * * * *

" Le cortége parcourt la grande nef de la basilique, s'arrête devant la chapelle du Saint-Sacrement, où le Pape fait une courte prière, traverse le portique et se rend processionnellement à la grande loge (*loggia*, balcon ou tribune) qui domine la place de Saint-Pierre.

" Une foule innombrable remplit la place immense ; sur les galeries et terrasses de la colonnade sont les siéges occupés par les princes et les étrangers distingués de toute nation. Le cortége entre et se range dans la *loggia*, la croix papale apparaît entre les sept chandeliers ; voici la *sedia* avec les flabelles, voilà le Pape, sous le grand dais flottant ; les chantres font retentir dans les airs les accents de Palestrina, *Corona aurea super caput ejus.*"

* * * * *

The Pope has made his appearance on the balcony, let us now observe the form and manner of his coronation.

* * * * *

"Le second Cardinal-Diacre ôte la mitre au Pape, et le premier Cardinal-Diacre, auquel est réservé le privilége de le couronner, lui met *la tiare sur* la tête en disant :

"*Accipe tiaram, tribus coronis ornatam, et scias te esse Patrem Principum et Regum, Rectorem orbis, in terra Vicarium Salvatoris nostri Jesu-Christi, Cui est honor, et gloria, in sæcula sæculorum. Amen.*

"'Reçois la tiare aux trois couronnes, et souviens-toi que tu es le Père des Princes et le *guide des Rois sur la Terre* *, le Vicaire de notre Sauveur Jésus-Christ, à qui est l'honneur et la gloire dans les siècles des siècles. Amen.'

"La *sedia* avance, portant vers le peuple, qui d'en bas contemple le Pontife couronné : deux Evêques à genoux tiennent l'un le livre, l'autre le cierge allumé, et le Pape prie.

* * * * *

"Le Pontife se lève ; il est debout sur la *sedia*, entre la terre et le ciel, les yeux en haut, les bras entrouverts, trois fois sa main trace dans l'air le signe de la croix, à droite et à gauche, devant lui ; il bénit : *Benedictio Dei Omnipotentis, Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, descendat super vos, et maneat semper. Amen.* Et l'*Amen*, trois fois répeté, remonte comme un seul

* It will be seen that the important words "*Rectorem Orbis*" are omitted in this French version, and that the sense is inadequately represented in other respects.

cri du sein de la multitude, et les cloches de la basilique et l'artillerie du château Saint-Ange l'accompagnent, le portent au loin.

"Avant de quitter la *loggia*, le Souverain-Pontife donne une dernière bénédiction, et la *sedia* rentre, pendant que le peuple se précipite aux avenues du portique pour prendre des mains des deux Cardinaux-Diacres assistants les formules imprimées (les unes en latin, les autres en italien) de l'indulgence plénière accordée à tous ceux qui ont reçu avec les dispositions requises la bénédiction papale."

Such, Sir, was the ceremonial of the Coronation of Pius IX. You will observe, that the *mitre* was removed from his head in order that the *tiara* or triple crown might be placed upon it: that is, the *sacerdotal* insigne was withdrawn, in order to make way for the *royal**: this having been done, he was hailed "Pater Principum et Regum, *Rector Orbis.*" And shall we

* Boniface VIII. (A.D. 1012—1024) was the first Pope who wore a double crown. The tiara, or triple crown, was first worn by Benedict XII. (A.D. 1334—1342.) See Pascal, Liturgie Catholique, p. 1195. The *Tiara* is called by Latin Romanist writers the *Regnum*, or royal badge,—see Du Cange v. *Regnum*,—and it signifies plenary power, temporal and spiritual. Cæremonial. Roman. lib. iii. "Tiara triplici coronâ ornata per quam significatur Sacerdotalis et Imperialis *summa* dignitas atque potestas." The following words of Durandus, Rationale III. xiii. 8, are very observable :—"Illud quoque notandum est, quod Romanus Pontifex in signum *imperii* utitur *regno*, id est, coronâ *imperiali*; et in signum *Pontificis* utitur *mitrâ*; sed *mitrâ semper* utitur et *ubique*; *regno* verò *non* semper, nec ubique, quia *Pontificis* auctoritas et *prior* est et *dignior* et *diffusior Imperiali* potestate."

now be told that the Roman Pontiff does not claim universal temporal power? Shall we be called upon to credit that he will not *assert* this claim wherever he is *able* to do so; and that those who are bound to him by oath, who behold in him the Vicar of Christ, and believe him to be infallible and to have power to forgive sins and to cancel oaths, will not aid him in his encroachments on the *temporal* power of Princes, and in his aims at universal dominion?

It may be true that Popes are not now in a condition to enforce these claims for themselves, but it is clear, that by allying themselves with a democratic power, they may give a semblance of piety to its aggressions against all constituted authority. They may thus make Revolution more formidable by lending it the name of Religion. This is the danger to be apprehended; and the Monarchs, Nobles, and Gentry of Europe have good reason to make a firm stand on the principles of pure Christianity and to display those principles in their public acts, or the time may come, sooner than they imagine, when they may be assailed by a lawless populace leagued against them with a Pope.

I am,

My dear Sir,

Yours faithfully.

LETTER XIII.

"It is to be remarked, that the value of any particular *Religious Establishment* is not to be estimated merely by what it is *in itself*, but also by what it is in comparison with those of *other nations*; and what is still more material, the value of *our own* ought to be much heightened in our esteem, by considering what it is a *security* from, I mean that *great corruption of Christianity,—Popery*, which is ever hard at work, to bring us under its yoke. Whoever will consider the Popish claims to the disposal of the whole earth, as of Divine right; to dispense with the most sacred engagements; the claims to supreme absolute authority in religion; in short, the general claims which the Canonists express by the terms *plenitude* of *power*, —whoever, I say, will consider Popery as it is at Rome, may see that it is a *manifest open usurpation of all Divine and human authority*."—Bp. Butler, Sermon before the House of Lords in the Abbey Church of Westminster, on the King's Accession, June 11, 1747.

You, my dear Sir, as a Roman Catholic residing in France as it now is, feel considerable difficulty in understanding how a sovereign can be—what we affirm our own most gracious Queen to be—supreme governor under Christ of a National Church. From personal intercourse with you, and with others of your country, I know this to be the case. You cannot comprehend, you say, how a Queen can have any *ecclesiastical* authority. I do not, indeed, believe that you would go so far as to approve the language

which, as our King James I. tells us *, was applied to his predecessor Queen Elizabeth by the Jesuit Sanders, who dared to assert that "the supremacy of a woman in Church matters is from no other than the devil;" or that you would adopt the words of one of your French divines, a vicar-general of a bishop, of the present day, who, in his directory for your clergy †, is so far forgetful of the apostolic command ‡, not to "speak evil of dignities," as to describe the illustrious wearer of the British crown as "une femme à la fois reine et papesse." But I know you and your countrymen generally are *now* strongly opposed—however in the times of your Fleurys and Dupins, De Marcas and Bossuets, the case might have been otherwise—to our English opinions on this subject; and as I am firmly persuaded that your objections to them arise in a great degree from misapprehension of their true nature, I shall, with your leave, endeavour to explain to you what our opinions *really are*.

We believe, then, that sovereign governing powers are Vicegerents and Ministers of Almighty God; for

* Works, p. 282, Lond. 1616.

† Guide des Curés, i. p. 454, Lyon, 3ème edition. Ce n'est qu'à Pétersbourg et à Londres, qu'un autocrate qui est roi-pontife, et qu'une femme à la fois reine et papesse peuvent s'ériger en régulateurs du culte et en juges du clergé des sectes grecque et protestantes qui se glorifient de ne relever que du pouvoir temporel. Mais dans l'Eglise Catholique il n'y a que les évêques, les métropolitains et le Pape pour procéder à l'examen des matières spirituelles.

‡ 2 Pet. ii. 10. Jude 8.

so we are taught by Him in Holy Writ *. We know from the same sacred course, that it is our duty to submit to civil authorities, to pay them tribute, to pray for them, "that we may lead quiet and peaceable lives in all *godliness* and *honesty;* for this is good and acceptable in the sight of God †." If, indeed, they should so far forget their duty as to command us to do any thing plainly contrary to the Word of God; if they should order us to commit idolatry, or not to pray to God, or not to receive His sacraments, rather than be guilty of these sins we should prefer the furnace with the three children of Babylon, and the den of lions with Daniel, and the rack with the Maccabees. Yes, we obey Cæsar for God's sake, but we cannot disobey God for Cæsar's; but in all his lawful and not unlawful commands we obey Cæsar, because we cannot disobey God.

True, you will reply, in all *temporal* matters, by all means; but *there* you must stop. No, we answer, we cannot stop here; for God commands us to proceed further. If, Sir, we consider *what* civil powers are commanded by God to do for Him, we shall soon perceive that *our duty* to them extends beyond these limits. Sovereigns (and when I speak of sovereigns I include *all* governing powers, whether *mon-*

* Rom. xiii. 1—6. 1 Pet. ii. 13.

† 1 Tim. ii. 1—3. Matt. xxii. 21. Rom. xiii. 1—7. Tit. iii. 1. 1 Pet. ii. 13.

archical or others) are God's "ministers" to us "for good*," not only of our bodies, but our souls; and it would be very degrading to them, and very irreverent to Him, Whose ministers they are, to suppose that their care is to be limited to the *temporal* wants of their subjects. No; here is the true dignity, the glorious prerogative of the magisterial office; it extends to the *soul;* it has hopes and aims "full of immortality." It looks to eternity; it sows on earth, that it may reap in heaven. Thus earthly and heavenly happiness is wreathed into one crown. Yes; since the Almighty Himself gives to kings and queens the title of "nursing fathers and nursing mothers" of His Church†, and since this is promised as a *blessing* to His Church, and since it is the *chief* duty of fathers and mothers in their families to provide for the *spiritual* welfare of their offspring, it cannot be supposed that the eternal interests of their subjects are not to be the *first*‡ care of magistrates. This being so, it follows that they have a divine *right* to those powers, without which this *duty* cannot be performed. That is to say, Kings have royal authority in spiritual matters as well as in temporal. Let us examine in what this consists.

First, then, it certainly does *not* extend to the performance of any *sacred* function, such as the

* Rom. xiii. 4—6. † Isa. xlix. 29.

‡ Bp. Andrewes, Opuscula, p. 380. Religionis cura non modo regia est, sed in regiis prima.

ministration of the Word or Sacraments, or the ordination of Ministers of the Church. The power of performing these offices is derived from God alone, and is restricted to those spiritual persons to whom He has assigned it. He struck King Uzziah * with leprosy for invading the priestly office; and the prince who dared to consecrate priests † was Jeroboam.

Sanders, indeed, and other Jesuits of his day, pretended to believe that Queen Elizabeth assumed to herself the sacred office of ministering the Word and Sacraments, and they studiously promulgated a scandalous calumny to that effect. But this imputation was solemnly repudiated by Queen Elizabeth ‡ herself, and by our Church in her Articles §, and by our greatest divines ‖. From all which it appears, than when our sovereigns claim supremacy over all persons in all causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil, they assert their right and acknowledge their duty (*not* to perform any sacred function in their own persons,) but to see that all they who have sacred functions assigned to them perform them duly. The royal supremacy in ecclesiastical matters in England

* 2 Chron. xxvi. 18. † 1 Kings xiii. 33.

‡ In her admonition; see Bp. Gibson, Codex, p. 54.

§ Art. XXXVII.

‖ Bp. Andrewes, Opuscula, p. 380. Bp. Bilson, Christian Subjection, p. 149. Archbishop Bramhall, ii. 219, 220. Bp. Stillingfleet, Eccl. Cases, ii. 97. Mason, de Minist. Angl. iii. c. 3. Bp. Taylor, Duct. Dub. iii. 3. Abp. Wake, Authority of Christian Princes, pp. 10—12.

does *not* admit of the exercise of any priestly power on the part of the sovereign, but it *does* imply that it is the office of the sovereign to command all those who have that power to *use it rightly.*

It appears further, from the same authorities, that this ecclesiastical supremacy is no other than that which belonged to the princes of God's own people, the Jews; and to the first and greatest emperors of Christendom. I pass briefly over this topic, but I cannot forbear reminding you of the important fact, that those of the Jewish rulers who exercised this authority most vigilantly and energetically,—as, for instance, David in convoking religious assemblies, in bringing back the ark, in regulating the courses of the priests, Solomon in building, Joash in restoring, Hezekiah and Josiah in purifying, the temple, in republishing the book of the law, in putting down idolatry and superstition, and in bringing back the people to the true worship of God, in a word, in effecting a great religious *Reformation,*—are distinguished with special commendations and benedictions by God in Holy Writ.

But, you may say, let it be granted that the Jewish law furnishes precedents for the supremacy which you are maintaining, what authority have you in *Christian* antiquity for your principles and practice? I do not hesitate to say, Sir, in reply, that we have the *unanimous consent of all* ancient Christen-

dom, after the empire ceased to be pagan, in favour of our English laws in ecclesiastical matters.

Compare, I would request you, my dear Sir, *our* system in this respect with that of *Rome*. A Roman Catholic bishop derives all his authority from the *Pope*. No Romanist archbishop can consecrate a church, or confirm a child, without receiving the *Pallium* from Rome*. All Romanist prelates are what they are, not by Divine Providence or permission, but by the grace of the Papal see! All this is in direct defiance of the laws and practice of the ancient Church. It is notorious that "most princes in the west, as in Germany, France, and England, did invest bishops till the time of Gregory VII.†" It is certain, also, that the popes of Rome, who now claim‡ a right to ordain and place bishops throughout the world, were themselves appointed by the emperor till the ninth century§; and the Church of England treads in the steps of the ancient Church, when she acknowledges the English Crown to have the right of placing persons, whose spiritual qualifi-

* Pontificale Romanum, p. 87. Antequam obtinuerit quis pallium, licet sit consecratus, non sortitur nomen patriarchæ, primatis aut archiepiscopi; et non licet ei episcopos consecrare, nec convocare concilium, nec chrisma conficere, neque ecclesias dedicare, nec clericos ordinare.

† See Barrow on the Pope's Supremacy, p. 228, ed. 1683.

‡ Bellarmin. de Rom. Pontific. ii. c. 18. Habet potestatem constituendi et confirmandi episcopos per totum orbem.

§ See S. Gregorii Vita, lib. i. p. 216, Paris, 1705. De Marca, viii. 14.

cations have been ascertained and approved by the spiritual authorities, in the sees *which the Crown itself has founded*, and in allowing them to *exercise* episcopal jurisdiction over its subjects within the limits duly assigned to them.

Again, the Church of Rome, as we have seen in the episcopal oath (above, p. 295), claims the power of convoking bishops from all parts of the world to attend her in her councils, and allows no ecclesiastical law to have any authority without her sanction. This too is in contradiction of ancient practice. *All* the General Councils of antiquity were summoned by *sovereign princes;* and there is not a single instance of any one Council claiming to be general, convoked by the *Pope* of Rome, for a thousand years* after Christ; and the laws made by bishops in councils depended for their ratification and publication on the sovereign power†. Who then is the true follower of Christian Antiquity, the Church of Rome—which obliges bishops by an oath to quit their own dioceses, whenever summoned to Italy by the Bishop of Rome, and to attend upon his calling, perhaps for near twenty years together, if the Romish synods are to last as long as the Council of Trent, and which asserts‡ that the canons of councils de-

* Bp. Andrewes, On the Right and Power of Calling Assemblies, vol. v. pp. 141—168.

† Bp. Andrewes, Opuscula, p. 165.

‡ Card. Bellarmin. de Pontifice Rom. Tota firmitas Conciliorum est a Pontifice.

pend for their validity on the Pope's assent—or the Church of England, which declares* "that General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes," and which acknowledges the right of her own sovereigns to summon the bishops and clergy of the realm to meet together in convocation†, and to give effect to their decrees by sentence of ratification?

In all these ecclesiastical matters, that is, in the placing of bishops, in the summoning of councils and in ratifying their decrees, we acknowledge our sovereigns to have supreme jurisdiction over spiritual persons, to the exclusion of all *foreign* power, whether lay or ecclesiastical, and *according to* the ancient principles and practices of the Christian Church, and *for* the *maintenance* of her laws: but, observe, *against* these received laws and customs of the Church, no power is claimed by our princes, nor is any ascribed to them by us‡. "*Nihil* potest rex, nisi quod *jure* potest," is our maxim. Our most gracious Queen has *supreme* power *according* to the laws, and *for* the laws, but *against* them, *none*. And we go further and say, that this jurisdiction, which I have described, is an inalienable prerogative of the English

* Art. XXI.

† See Declaration prefixed to Thirty-nine Articles.

‡ Lord Clarendon, on Religion and Polity. "As sovereign princes cannot prescribe what laws they please, contrary to the laws of nature and of God, so they cannot impose what religion they please, contrary to what He has enjoined."

crown. You speak to us sometimes of our King John and Henry the Second, as having brought their realm under the spiritual dominion of the Pope. But, Sir, not *all* the kings who ever sat on the throne of England could do this. As Lord Chancellor Clarendon says, "The king of England has *no power* to release a *single* grain of the *allegiance* which is due to him*."

The supremacy of our sovereigns in ecclesiastical matters, and over spiritual persons as well as civil, is founded not on any human basis, but on the Word of God. "Let *every* soul be subject to the higher powers," says the Apostle† St. Paul, and "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the king‡, as *supreme*," says St. Peter. It rests on the will of God, Whose ministers and representatives sovereign princes are, and Whose work human society is; and the throne of the one and the peace of the other can never be secure, while the Sovereign has only a *divided* sway, and while his partner in it is the Pope.

Observe, my dear Sir, I do not say that the *exercise* of this power may not be greatly embarrassed by reckless and revolutionary legislation, or may not

* State Papers of Edward Earl of Clarendon, vol. ii. p. 309. So Hammond, ii. p. 133, "The king *cannot* alienate his regality." Thus he *could not* give *titles* from *English cities* to *English Romanist bishops*, on the ground of their consecration by the Pope; for this would be an alienation of the regale, and "an act against the known laws and liberties of the kingdom."

† Rom. xiii. 1. ‡ 1 Pet. ii. 13.

fall into decay by the neglect of those to whom it is committed; for we all know that the *possession* of *rights* supposes the *discharge* of *duties*. Monarchs, therefore, may become mere phantoms, by the fault of their subjects or their own. Remove from Monarchy its *religious* responsibilities, make it *indifferent* to Religion, so that it may treat all creeds alike, and you rob it of all the respect of its subjects, who will regard it with offence as a mis-shapen abstract of their own anomalies, as an unsightly epitome of all their own religious deformities. A Crown without a conscience is a mere bauble, or rather it will be looked upon as a splendid grievance, which a heavily taxed and restless Nation in an utilitarian age will soon condemn to destruction.

By your *Charte* of 1830, France ceased to have a *national* religion. She then thought fit to *suppress* the article of the Charte of 1814, which declared that she had a "religion de *l'Etat.*" By the same Charte of 1830, she gave endowments to *various forms* of Christianity, and in 1831 she *extended them* to *Judaism*. Let us mark the consequences of these unhappy acts. She did not, it is true, directly deprive the crown of its supremacy, but she did virtually; she paralyzed the *exercise* of it. The Charte robbed the *crown of its Creed;* it divested the Monarch of his religious character; it took from beneath his throne its only true support—Christianity. *Before* 1830, the language in France was

"Le Roi ne tient sa couronne que de *Dieu* et de son épée;" but *now* it is "Il ne tient sa couronne que de la *Révolution*, fille de la Philosophie*." The State by endowing *all* religions does in fact endow *none*. It endows religious *indifference*. It has estranged the Church from the Throne, and placed it at the feet of the Pope. By the Charte of 1830, France *intended* to establish the sovereignty of the *People*, but the event has shown that she advanced that of the *Pope*. *No bull* which ever issued from the Roman Vatican in the days of Hildebrand has done so much for the *Papal power* in France, as the popular *Charte* of 1830, which decreed the *equality of all religions*. You, my dear Sir, know full well what the language of the Roman Catholic Church of France *now* is. As *long* as the *Crown* had a *conscience* and a *creed*, (of course I am speaking of the *office* alone,) so long the Church allows she owed it reverence. But *now* that the Crown regards all creeds as equal, the case is very different; and the Church cannot (she says) any longer admit that the Crown has any right to exercise any authority over her. No; the eyes of the Church of France are now turned away, alas! from the *royal throne to the Papal chair*. Instead of being a *National* Establishment,—may I not say, *the* great conservative establishment of the nation?—the Church of France has become an *extra-national* and *antinational* one.

* Journal des Débats, 13 Juin, 1845.

In proof of this, let me appeal to the course the Church has pursued and is still pursuing in the great question of National Education. On one side we see the civil power—and the *eighty* bishops of France on the *other*. They assert that the State, having ceased to be Christian, has no right to* interfere with public instruction; that it cannot any longer pretend to discharge the great duty of a state, that of improving the moral and religious condition of the people, especially of the poor; that it has forfeited the power of maintaining truth and repressing error; that the whole work of instruction must be left, without any restraint or direction, to the energies of individuals, that is, in fact, to the *Church* of *France*, with all her *ultramontane affections and obligations*, on the one side, and to the democratic licence of an *infidel philosophy* on the other.

This is a deplorable condition of things, and one which (unless Divine Providence should interfere)

* Thus, for instance, the Archbishop and suffragans of Bourges in their memorial to the king in council, 16th April, 1844. *Aujourd'hui* l'état ne saurait revendiquer sur l'Education les droits qu'il exerçait sous *l'ancien régime*, car alors il y avait union entre l'église et l'état. Mais à présent *ce principe est aboli*. La religion catholique n'est plus la religion de l'état. La Charte proclame la liberté des consciences et des cultes, et l'état, qui est mis en dehors des croyances religieuses, ne peut aspirer à diriger l'Education. And a layman, Count de Harrer, in his translation of the Archbishop of Cologne's work on the relations of Church and State, Paris, 1144, p. 114, says, Lorsque, comme en France, *l'état* ne professe aucune religion, il est virtuellement *athée*, et par conséquent inhabile à donner aucun enseignement religieux quel qu'il puisse être.

must inevitably produce in *a very short time* results too dreadful to contemplate. What indeed can be more lamentable than to see that they—I mean the bishops of France—who ought to be the most faithful and zealous supporters of the throne, and who would doubtless be so, if their circumstances were different, that is, if they were released from their oath of vassalage to the pope and if the *Crown* had a *creed*, are in fact now the devoted subjects of *a foreign and hostile power?*

A slight incident will illustrate what I am saying. The *reappearance* of the Proper Lesson for Gregory the VIIth's Day in your Parisian and Lyonnaise Breviary of 1842 (to which I alluded in my last Letter*) speaks volumes concerning the ultramontane spirit which now animates your Church. But what I now advert to is a different circumstance, though not of a dissimilar kind. Your bishops take an oath to the pope†, one of the clauses of which is, that they will visit Rome once in so many years, and render an account to him of the state of their dioceses. By your *civil* laws the bishop is bound to obtain the leave of the Crown before he quits his diocese on his journey to Rome‡. But when, the year before last, one of your prelates visited Rome, and it was stated that he had *not* obtained any such previous permission, your reply was, that the preventive law

* See above, p. 290.

† See above, p. 295.

‡ Articles Organiques, section iii. § 20.

might have been very well for the time of Louis XIV., when the sovereigns of France bore the august title of *most Christian king*, but that it would be a violation of the *liberties of the Church*, if it were enforced *now**. Upon which I would only beg leave to ask one question: If this be so, *whose* subjects are your bishops? the King's or the Pope's?

Let me add another observation on the papal advantages derived from what is not unfrequently, but most untruly, called *popular* legislation. About a year ago you suppressed the order of *Jesuits* in France. This was no new thing with you. In 1610, the year of the murder of Henry IV., you burnt their books by order of parliament. In 1644, your university† petitioned parliament against them, affirming that "their doctrines affected the security of all states and nations interested in preserving the authority and just power and life of their sovereigns." In 1682, your clergy, with the great Bossuet at their head, protected the crown and the constitution from their anti-monarchical and anti-social principles, by the declaration of the Gallican Articles. In 1763, the Parliament of Paris declared by its decree of the 6th of August, that the "order of Jesuits was by its nature inadmissible in all rightly-constituted states‡;" and it was suppressed accordingly.

* See Univers Catholique, 23 Nov. 1845.

† See the original words in the edition of Fleury's Discours sur les Libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane, 1765, p. 82.

‡ Ibid. p. 404.

But since your last Revolution affairs have greatly changed in your country, in this as in other matters. Your clergy appear to be desirous at present of *identifying* themselves with the *Jesuits*. Some of your bishops have come forward as their champions. The Bishop of Chartres declares in his published letter to the Minister of Religion *, that "he knows that many archbishops and bishops have intimated to him (the minister), that if the Jesuits are driven from their houses, they will be received by them into their palaces." What a change does this indicate in the *animus* of the Church of France toward the Crown! What a demonstration is here of its determination to make common cause with the papacy in its most anti-monarchical form!

Let us observe further, that not only the Church, being repudiated by the Crown, but the Crown also, being opposed by the Church, is driven to do homage to the Pope. The Pope gains both ways, by the separation of the two. He has become the common referee for both parties; and has grown in strength and importance accordingly. Instead of *prohibiting* appeals to Rome, your State is now *making* them in

* "Je sais, M. le Ministre, que plusieurs archevêques et évêques vous ont fait connaître que si les Jésuites étaient chassés de leurs maisons ceux-ci trouveraient un asile dans celles qu'ils habitent eux-mêmes." *Lettre* de Mgr. l'Evêque de Chartres à M. le Ministre des Cultes, 19 Mai, 1845. See also the letter of the Bp. of Chalons to the *Univers*, 28 May, 1845.

its own behalf. Your most zealous Romanists deplored the recent suppression of the Jesuits in France, but they must have derived great consolation from the *manner* in which that measure was effected. The State said to the Jesuits, "We know you to be dangerous to our peace and safety, and we therefore wish you to be suppressed;" but it did *not* say, as was *formerly* the case, and as, *if it* were independent, it certainly would have done *now*,—"We know you to be dangerous, and, therefore, *we* exercise *our own power*, and we suppress you." No: Signor Rossi is sent to Rome, on a special mission to the Pope, to persuade him to use his influence with father Roothman, the General of the Jesuits, for their suppression; and they are withdrawn from France accordingly. What was this but a *public announcement of the feebleness of the civil power*, and of the *superiority of that of the Pope?* He might have been sorry to exercise this power, and probably he was in the present case; but then the *appeal* to him to exercise it, was a recognition of its existence on the part of France.

Nothing can be more gratifying to him, or more conducive to his aggrandisement, than such applications as these from sovereign princes, that he would be pleased to *vouchsafe them the benefit of his pontifical interference to keep their kingdoms quiet.* Some assert that England will one day entreat him to govern Ireland for her, by a pacificating bull to the

Romish hierarchy. He well knows, that in being called in by princes and states, to read these his irenical and ironical homilies, his universal power is acknowledged. How must he rejoice in such appeals as these! See, he must say, how necessary the papacy is to the world! How could you manage your people without me? You speak of me as a disturber of public tranquillity; but the fact is, as your petitions to me show, I am the great pacificator of the world.

So it is now, my dear Sir; political storms are raised by winds let loose from the papal caverns, and *then* the Pope is implored by civil governments to allay them; and he even pretends to be angry (like the poet's Neptune) with the political Euri and Zephyri, which have broken forth from his own Æolia!—"Quos ego" (he exclaims)

"—— sed motos præstat componere fluctus *."

And he, the canonizer of Hildebrand, will preach sermons on loyalty, forsooth, for the benefit of kings! Thus he did to the Polish bishops in 1832 †, and so again last year to those of Galicia, in his brief to the Bishop of Tarnow ‡; and as he did a little while since

* Virgil, Æn. i. 135.

† See the Brief in the Pièces Justificatives of La Mennais' Affaires de Rome, p. 309.

‡ Which will be found in the "Tablet" of April 18, 1846. It is observable that the Pope there exhorts the Clergy to obey the em-

to the titular prelates of Ireland; and as I doubt not, the man did to the stag, for the special benefit of the horse, in the apologue of Horace *, with which the Pope is doubtless familiar; and once placed on the horse's back, at the horse's request, he remains there firmly seated for ever—

> "Cervus equum, pugnâ melior, communibus herbis
> Pellebat, donec minor in certamine longo
> Imploravit opes *Hominis*, frænumque recepit;
> Sed postquam violens victo decessit ab hoste,
> Non equitem dorso, non frænum depulit ore."

Let those sovereigns who humbly sue to the Pope for *concordats*, wherewith to keep their own subjects in order, bethink them betimes how they will be able to shake the *Man* from off their backs, and to get his bit out of their mouths.

Let, I say in sober sadness, both sovereigns and subjects reflect, that if they do not maintain and strengthen the *one* foundation on which governments can rest independently and immoveably, namely, true religion, the *royal power is gone*, and the safety, the happiness, and the liberties of their subjects are destroyed; and the world may shortly be prepared to see this fearful consequence—that the only surviving power claiming to exist by divine institution will be

peror, "*nisi* forte aliquid imperetur, quod Dei et *Ecclesiæ* legibus adversatur." The very same expression occurs in the Encyclic Letter of the present Pope. We know what the "leges Ecclesiæ" are. See above, p. 278—286 and p. 292.

* Hor. Epist. i. 10. 34.

that of the Pope, and all thrones, which are not swept away by infidel fury, will exist only as feudatories of the papacy.

But to return. I have referred to the example of France in what I have now written; but you will not, I hope, imagine that what I have said is dictated by any unfriendly feeling towards your institutions, or that I think it may not be applied in a considerable degree, with equal justice, to ourselves. Indeed, if the truth is to be told, many of us in England are much more deficient in the discharge of our duty to our own sovereign than you are to yours. You are, for the most part, Roman Catholics; and believing as you do—though, as we think, very erroneously—that the Pope is the father of the faithful, and the vicar of our Lord upon earth, you may regard the extension of his power without dissatisfaction; and considering the unhappy condition to which your monarchy has been reduced, you may feel more loyalty to the Roman see, than to the throne of the sovereigns of France.

But our case is very different. Publicly we know nothing of the Pope except as a foreign potentate, who has presumed to excommunicate us, and pretended to depose three of our monarchs, and to send a Spanish Armada against us, and to place our country under an Interdict.

Besides, by the Divine goodness, we have still a *Christian* monarchy; and by the blessing of Heaven

on the valour and wisdom of our ancestors, we have a constitution in which the supremacy of the sovereign over all persons in all causes is so happily established, that I venture to affirm that no nation in the world can show a framework of government so well adapted to secure the rights of the sovereign and the liberties of the subject from domestic and foreign usurpation, whether lay or ecclesiastical. *Our only* danger is *from ourselves.*

And it must be confessed with sorrow, that (notwithstanding the solemn warning which we have from *your* example) much has been done and much is *now* being done by some who bear the name of Englishmen for the disorganization and disruption of this well-concerted system; much for the destruction of the foundations of our throne, and for the disturbance of our domestic peace.

To speak briefly of particulars:—

I. You are aware that some persons in this country are desirous of legalizing the settlement of *Jesuits* in England, although it is notorious that their principles are destructive of public and private happiness *, and that they take an oath of implicit obedience to the Pope †; and are not and *cannot* be the subjects of

* See above pp. 64—69, 71, and pp. 216—218, and p. 322.

† Literæ Apostolicæ, quibus institutio, confirmatio, et varia privilegia continentur Societatis Jesu, Antwerp, 1635. p. 11. 63. Speciali voto astringimur, ut *quicquid* modernus et alii *Romani pontifices jus-*

any temporal sovereign, much less of a Protestant one. Here they outrun you in zeal for the papacy; *you lately suppressed* the order of Jesuits in France, this year they would establish them in England.

II. Secondly, some of us in England would take upon themselves to exercise the royal prerogative, and, indirectly, to *confer* titles by the removal of the present penalties for their assumption; and *what* titles, do you suppose, and upon *whom?* the titles of the sees into which they have irregularly intruded themselves, upon Roman Catholic ecclesiastics in England and Ireland! Not to say that such a deed as this would be one of flagrant schism *, inasmuch as it would set up bishop against bishop, and altar against altar, from one end of Great Britain to the other, and an act of most unwarrantable injustice towards the present holders of these titles; it would also be an invasion of the rights of the Crown, and a destruction of the foundations of the British throne. All titles of honour are derived from the Crown alone †; and the *assertion of a right to share* with *the Crown* in *conferring them* is an *encroach-*

serint, ad profectum animarum et fidei propagationem, illicò exequi teneamur.

* S. Cyprian, ep. 52. Quisquis post unum episcopum factus est, non jam secundus ille, sed nullus est. Ep. 67. Foris esse cœpit qui, episcopo ordinato, profanum altare erigere, adulteram cathedram collocare tentaverit.

† Blackstone, i. 7. iv. The Crown has "the *sole* power of conferring dignities and honours." See also above, p. 317, *note*.

ment on the royal prerogative; and I would respectfully venture to express a doubt whether even *deliberation* upon it is not very like an unconstitutional usurpation of that nature. It would, I say, Sir, seem worthy of consideration, whether it is not an invasion of the *Queen's rights* for *subjects to discuss the collation of titles at all* *, and, secondly, and much more so, to deliberate on the collation of them on *Romanist* bishops, *as such;* an act which I venture to affirm is not *even* within *the power* of the *Crown to perform* †. If ecclesiastics, intruded on us by the Pope, consecrated by his sole appointment, and bound to him by an oath of vassalage, should ever be thereby qualified, *ipso facto*, to bear English titles, then the regalities of the English Crown would be annulled, and the protest that "no foreign prince, prelate, or potentate, had any jurisdiction, power, or authority in this realm of England" would be void ‡. "*No* bishop, no king," said King James §; but put *two* bishops—one of them a subject of the Pope—

* The following notice concerning Foreign Orders, which appeared in the "London Gazette" of December 6, 1823, seems to be applicable to *titles* conferred by the Pope: "1. No *British subject shall accept a Foreign Order*, or wear its Insignia, without having previously obtained a Warrant under the Royal Sign Manual (directed to the Earl Marshal of England), granting them His Majesty's permission to accept and wear the same."

† See above, p. 317.

‡ Oath of Supremacy: see above, p. 277.

§ See Judicium Acad. Oxon. de Solenni Liga, p. 19.

into the same see, and then, "*two* bishops, and *no* king," would be at least, equally true.

III. Thirdly, another proposition, to which I must here advert, is that of endowing the Roman Catholic Clergy of Ireland at the national expense. With many who would advise this course, the *religious* argument would probably avail little. It would, perhaps, be useless to say to them, that by endowing Romanism, the State would endow religious *error* of the most destructive kind, both as regards sacred and civil matters; and that, by erecting a co-ordinate Church, where there *is* a Church already established, which ought to be supported and strengthened both on religious and secular grounds, it would endow *Schism* and all its injurious consequences, feuds, factions, and confusions, and would render the restoration of peace almost unattainable in that country, under any circumstances.

Perhaps, however, it may be of use to us all to remember what you, Sir, know to be the fact, that the Church of *Rome* is a very differently constituted Ecclesiastical body from the United Church of *England* and *Ireland*. We *speak* of endowing the Roman Catholic Clergy; be it so: there are 28 Irish Romanist Bishops, 1008 Parish Priests, and 1385 Curates *, now in Ireland; these would require a large sum for their endowment: but this is not the main point; when they *had* been *purchased* by the Government,

* See Irish Ecclesiastical Register for 1846, p. 336.

they would be worth *nothing*. It is to be feared that a great part of the influence of the Priests over the populace is due to the notion that they are like Tribunes of the People, its Champions against their rulers; and if the Priests were endowed by the State, it would be supposed by the *people* that their Priests had been *bought* by the Government not for any love of them, but in order that they might be *subservient* to it; and thus the influence of the Priests over them would become null; and then that *other* element of the Romish Ecclesiastical body would come into play, I mean the *Regular* Clergy, the Monks and Friars, who even now amount to 300 * in Ireland, and who would *succeed* †,

* See the Irish Directory for 1846, p. 331. All this was well put, in 1805, in a speech in Parliament by Mr. Perceval :—

"The principal of the arguments in favour of a national payment for the Roman Catholic priest is, that it will give the *Government* a hold upon the Roman Catholic priest, and be the means of attaching the priesthood to the interest of that Government, *of which*, at present, *they* are wholly *independent*, if they be not *radically hostile and averse to it*.

"Now, Sir, if this be either the avowed, or the suspected, object of the indulgence, will it not, I ask, instantly *defeat itself*? Would not a Roman Catholic Priest, by accepting this offer, become an object of jealousy *to his own body*; of *distrust to his own flock*? Would it not detach him greatly from it; and so deprive the Government of all the hope of utility proposed by the connexion; and give rise to *a new set of popular and independent priests*,—most probably of the *Regular Orders*,—who will enjoy the lost influence of those whom Government has purchased?"

† It may be conjectured that the present proposals of certain parties for legalizing the *Regulars* is made under an expectation that the *Seculars* will be endowed.

in increased numbers and power, to the place of those who are pensioned, and would exercise *more* than all *their* influence for evil in the cause of agitation. This proposal, therefore, appears to be very short-sighted, even as one of mere political expediency.

IV. Fourthly, it is proposed by some, that bulls from Rome should be introduced without any let or hindrance, and be recognized as having legal validity. Those who know Rome best—Spain, Austria, Portugal, and France, all Roman Catholic countries,—will not allow a single Papal bull to be introduced, before *it is carefully examined by the civil power* * ; and you, my dear Sir, must smile at the temerity and self-conceit of some of *us* who appear to consider themselves much wiser than all European nations, since they propose that *we*, a *Protestant* people, should admit freely from Rome what Roman Catholic states carefully exclude.

What, Sir, may be asked, would then become of our love for our sovereign? what of our loyalty for the monarch who is alive? what of our reverence for the dead? Surely it would be an insult to the living and to the departed kings and queens of England, to legalize the admission of these papal edicts, when we know what has been, and *still is*, their language toward the holders of the English crown. As long as those impious, sanguinary, and treasonable anathemas, which

* See Report of Select Committee on Regulation of Roman Catholic Subjects in Foreign Countries. Lond. 1816, pp. 3—35.

were pronounced by the Roman pontiff against Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth *, as long as that tissue of curses against *all* Protestant princes and people, contained in the bull *In Cœnâ Domini*, remain in the pages of the *Roman Bullarium;* so long, I say, it would appear to be a treasonable † act against the Crown, an act of outrage against the Divine Being, Whose Minister the Queen is, and one of contumelious scorn towards her subjects, to propose to legalize the admission of bulls from Rome into England.

V. Fifthly, it is proposed to relieve English Romanists from all penalties for asserting the Pope's Spiritual Supremacy in these realms, in opposition to that of the Queen ‡; and for extolling and main-

* See above, p. 283.

† Concerning the bull against Queen Elizabeth, (which, as well as that against Henry VIII., is still retained in the Bullarium,) Lord Keeper Burleigh thus wrote: "The Pope's bull aforementioned, imports that her Majesty is not lawful Queen of England,—the first and highest point of *treason;* and that all her subjects are discharged of their oaths and obedience,—another high point of *treason;* and all warranted to disobey her and her laws,—a third and very large point of *treason*."—Burleigh's "Execution of Justice in England, not for Religion, but for Treason," 17 Dec., 1583, p. 15.

‡ The consequences of this proposal may be anticipated from the terms of the following letter of Sir Valentine Blake, to the Lord Chancellor of Ireland:—

"*Paris. Place de la Madeleine, September* 24, 1846.

"My Lord,

"I had the honour to receive a letter written by your Lordship's directions, yesterday, wherein it is intimated to me that my name is reinstated in its proper place in the commission of the peace

taining his pretended and usurped power over her subjects.

What is this but to call upon the State to legalize a public profession on their part, that they are *not* subjects of the Crown; and to make this *non-subjection* of theirs the occasion, groundwork, and reason for legislative innovations and aggressions against the Crown and the Constitution? or, in other words, because it is true that some persons are disloyal enough to deny the independence of the Crown, and to pay little regard even to the personal safety of the monarch (for the Pope affirms that deposed sovereigns may be murdered; and *what* sovereign of *England*—indeed, what *Protestant* sovereign—is *not ipso facto* deposed * by the Pope?)—

for the county of Galway, for which I beg to return you my most sincere thanks.

"The Clerk of the Hanaper has enclosed to me the form of oaths to be taken, and, inasmuch as it is required that I should swear that the *see of Rome*, or the potentate who occupies the papal throne, has *no spiritual power* within the realms of her Majesty, which we all know is untrue, I am sorry that I must refuse to take such an oath; and I am only surprised that *other* conscientious *Protestants* should do so; but I hope shortly to see your Lordship on the woolsack of the Irish House of Lords, as the keeper of her Majesty's conscience in Ireland, bringing in a bill to abolish the taking of such an oath.

"I have the honour to be, my Lord,
"Your Lordship's most faithful,
and obedient, humble Servant,
"VALENTINE BLAKE."

"The Lord Chancellor of Ireland."

* See above, p. 283. The Pope told Queen Elizabeth at her accession, that England "era feudo della sede apostolica; ch' era stata una grand' audacia dell' haver' assonto il nome di Regina ed il

therefore the rights of the Crown, instead of being more vigorously asserted, are to be sacrificed! and the person of the sovereign, instead of being more carefully guarded, is to be put in more imminent peril!

But, Sir, you may desire to know on what grounds such propositions as these are made.

I. First, then, it is alleged that the laws which these propositions would repeal are "the offspring of a *dark age.*" A *dark* age! The age of Shakspeare, of Spenser, of Ben Jonson, of Burleigh, and Salisbury, and Raleigh, of Bacon, and of Coke, of Jewell, and Hooker, and of Andrewes! A dark age! *Dark* indeed, in a certain sense, it was, when those deeds of darkness were performed under the authority and with the approval of the *Papacy*, which rendered those laws necessary:—dark indeed it was, when on the night of the 24th of August, 1572, St. Bartholomew's day, about five thousand Protestants were butchered at Paris, and when within a few days after it, in six towns of France, five-and-twenty thousand more were slain *:—dark it was when as soon as he heard of this dreadful massacre, Pope Gregory XIII. went in procession to the Church of St. Louis, at Rome †, to give God thanks; and when, to com-

governo senza lui."—Sarpi's History of the Council of Trent, lib. v. See also Ranke's History of the Popes, pp. 80, 81.

* Ranke (History of the Popes, p. 147) says, "the numbers that fell amounted to 50,000."

† Lord Clarendon, Religion and Polity, p. 427. "Notorious it is

memorate this event, he ordered a medal to be struck *, which represents the savage work as performed by an *angel* of heaven, with a sword in one hand and a cross in the other, and which bears the inscription, VGONOTTORVM STRAGES, THE MASSACRE OF THE HUGUENOTS : — dark it was, when on the 1st of August, 1589, the friar Jaques Clement †, "having learnt from theologians whom he had consulted, that a tyrant might lawfully be put to death," went and assassinated his own sovereign, your King Henry III. :—dark it was, when on hearing the intelligence of that King's death, Pope Sixtus V. summoned a consistory of his cardinals, and in a set speech ascribed the murder of the king "to the providence of God," and spoke of it as a pledge that "the Almighty would still protect France ‡ :"—dark

that Gregory XIII. had no sooner notice of that barbarous and inhuman massacre of St. Bartholomew, than he went in solemn procession to the Church of St. Louis in Rome to give God thanks."

* Of which I have an engraving before me in p. 87 of Historia Summorum Pontificum per eorum Numismata, a Molinet, Lutet. 1679, which is dedicated by the author to a Pope, Innocent XI.

† These are the words of the Jesuit Mariana, "Jac. Clemens cognito a theologis quos erat sciscitatus tyrannum jure interimi posse cæso rege ingens sibi nomen fecit." See Ranke's History, p. 177. Fleury, Discours sur les Libertés, &c. p. 80, note.

‡ "Il Papa nel consistorio discorre che 'l successo della morte del rè di Francia si ha da conoscer dal voler expresso del Signor Dio, e che perciò si doveva confidar che continuarebbe al haver quel regno nella sua protezione." Dispaccio Veneto, quoted by Ranke, p. 173 : compare Lord Clarendon, p. 465. "The news of this horrid parricide was no sooner brought to Rome, than the Pope presently called a consistory, that he might be the first reporter of it, when he made the

it was, when on the 14th of May, 1610, Ravaillac the Jesuit effected what, in 1594, Jean Chastel the Jesuit had attempted, and murdered your sovereign Henry IV., and, after the deed was done, freely confessed that it was the book of Mariana the Jesuit which encouraged him to that design * :—dark it was, when at several times after the publication of the Papal Bull against her in 1567, (Feb. 24,) the life of our gracious Queen Elizabeth was attempted, as in 1572 by Story, again in 1583 by Somerville, again in 1585 by Parry, stimulated by the Pope's nuncio, and in 1586 by Savage, having plenary indulgence from the Pope, as appears from the letter of a Cardinal di Como, dated Rome, 30 Jan., 1584, again by Moody in 1587, again by Patrick in 1594, by Lopez and York in the same year, again by Squire in 1598, by Winter in 1602 †, from all which traitorous

relation of it in such a manner as made it evident that he was well enough content to be thought the author; and he even solemnized the memory of the friar for his unparalleled zeal and courage, in that speech of his to the consistory, of which there are too many records preserved to have it ever forgotten." See also Thuani Historia, tom. iv. ad ann. 1589, ed. 1620, who says, "that Sixtus V., in a premeditated speech made in the consistory on the 3rd of the Ides of September, compared the deed on account of its greatness to our blessed Lord's incarnation and resurrection, and extolled the author of it above Eleazar and Judith, &c." The original Latin speech was printed at Paris in 1585. It will be found in Foulis' History of Romish treasons, p. 413. Davila Historia, lib. x. ad ann. 1589.

* De Rege et Regis Institutione, Mog. 1605. See notes to Fleury, Discours, p. 80, and P. Du Moulins' Anticoton, quoted by Bp. Barlow, Brutum fulmen, p. 196.

† See Camdeni Annales Elizabethæ, in these years.

designs, set on foot by the arts and arms of Rome, she was delivered by the merciful interference of Divine Providence; and dark it was, when in the year 1605, a conspiracy was made to destroy the king, royal family, lords and commons of England, and when Bulls from Rome were ready * to give complete effect to what was then decreed:—*dark*, I say, the age may well be called, when such acts as these were concerted and executed. But in another sense that age was one of *light*. Wisdom guided the councils of England, and sound laws were enacted, by which, under the Divine blessing, these dark designs were defeated, and the light of peace and liberty and public safety were diffused throughout the realm. *But*, if in a spirit of presumptuous contempt for the wisdom of that age, and of arrogant confidence in our own sagacity, *we* abolish these laws, who shall say that we shall not *bring back* in all its gloom the *thick darkness* which they dispersed?

In the mean time, if we desire to prove that we are ourselves in darkness, we have only to be guilty of the folly, as far as regards England, of calling that age a *dark* one. *If* that age was a dark one, would that we had more such darkness and less of our own

* See Bp. Andrewes' Reply to Cardinal Bellarmine, cap. v. p. 113, ed. 1610. "E vestris unus atque is Jesuita apud nos fassus est in id ipsum tempus, quo accensus hic pulvis et strages subsecuta procusum fuisse fulmen trisulcum, bullas tres, statim, ubi confecta res, Pontificis nomine publicandas, quibus tria in Regno loca confestim ferienda."

light! Would that we had more of its loyalty and piety, more of its steadiness of purpose, more of its faith in fixed principles, and more of its courage in carrying them into practice!

In further justice to these laws, I shall content myself with referring to the character which is given of them by three of our greatest statesmen and lawyers, Lord Treasurer Burleigh *, Lord High Chancellor Bacon †, and Lord High Chancellor Clarendon ‡.

II. But, secondly, it is alleged that these laws ought to be *repealed*, on the great principle of religious toleration; that none of "*Her Majesty's subjects*" ought to suffer penalties for "*religious opinions;*" and that our Most Gracious Sovereign ought "to be the Queen of *all* her subjects."

Now, first of all,—as to the point of *repealing* laws against the *Pope*, *I* should be very glad to be informed whether *he* has ever repealed *any one* of *his* laws against *us?* Has he ever erased a *single line* of his *canon law* in which, as I have shown §, he claims the power of deposing princes and absolving subjects from their allegiance? Never. Has he ever revoked one of his unchristian anathemas against us

* Lord Burleigh, Execution of Justice in England, not for Religion, but for Treason, 1583.

† Lord Bacon, Observations on a Libel, 1592, vol. ii. p. 42, ed. Lond. 1778.

‡ Lord Clarendon, Religion and Polity, p. 424.

§ Above, p. 279.

and our princes? Never. Has he ever ceased to impose *his* own *oaths of allegiance and supremacy* on Romish ecclesiastics who are subjects of the Queen of England, and to teach them that all their *civil* oaths to their sovereign, to the prejudice of his own interest, are perjuries? Never. Has he ever allowed a word to be breathed in favour of *our oaths of allegiance and supremacy*, or permitted our books in its favour to be admitted into his dominions, as some of us would admit bulls from Rome into England? Never. And yet we are, forsooth, to be called upon to repeal *our* laws against *his* unjust and unholy usurpations and aggressions against the rights of the British crown and the liberties of the subject, and to give free admission and even titles of distinction to Jesuits and other Romish ecclesiastics, who are bound to him by a most solemn oath of obedience, and who are obliged by that oath to teach the doctrine of the Pope's supremacy, and by consequence to subvert that of the Queen! And all this on the "sacred principle of religious *Toleration!*" O most blessed Toleration, which would *tolerate every thing* but that which ought most to be secured and encouraged! which would tolerate sedition, and discountenance loyalty; which would tolerate Jesuits and the Pope, but would *not* tolerate the *Queen;* which would sacrifice the Crown, and boast of its liberality; which would talk of "civil and religious liberty," and degrade its sovereign to a slave!

But, thirdly, it is said, "Her *Majesty's subjects*" ought to be relieved from all "penalties and disabilities in regard to their *religious opinions.*" Certainly, this is very true: but then, first, it is equally true that they who *ought* to be *Her* Majesty's subjects and are *not*, but who choose to be the *Pope's* subjects, ought *not* to be relieved from penalties and disabilities in regard to their *irreligious practices.* Under the words "*religious* opinions" lurks the old fallacy, which was exposed so well by Lord Burleigh, in that "dark age" of which we have just heard, in his admirable work entitled "Execution of *Justice* in England, not for *Religion*, but *Treason.*"

He there says *, speaking of papists who were punished for traitorous practices in Queen Elizabeth's reign, that "whereas the party of the pope, the principal author of the invasion of Her Majesty's dominions, do *allege* that a number of persons, whom they call *martyrs* †, died for defence of the Catholic *religion*, the same in very truth may manifestly appear to have died (if they will so have it) as *martyrs* for the *pope*, but *traitors* against their *queen*, in adhering to him." And in the same dark age, Lord Bacon tells us, "that Queen Elizabeth was firm to the resolution not to suffer the state of her kingdom to be ruined under *pretence* of *conscience* and *reli-*

* P. 15.

† See on this point Bishop Barlow's *Brutum Fulmen*, p. 187.

gion *." And, in the same manner, King James I. † writes, "I must ever avow and maintain, as the truth is according to mine own knowledge, that the late Queen of famous memory *never* punished any papist for *religion*, but that their own punishment was extorted out of her hands by their own *misbehaviour*," —which he proceeds to prove. They were punished, he shows, not for "*religious opinions*," but for "*rebellious acts*" under the fair name of religion, which was used by Pope Paul V. when he wrote, in his brief of Oct. 1, 1606, to all English Romanists, that "the oath of *allegiance* to the English crown could not be taken by them without injury to the *Catholic faith!*" and we know well (in the words of Bishop Sanderson) that "nothing is more common than for men to plead *conscience* when they have no mind to *obey*," and that disobedience and disloyalty is *no* part of *religion*, nor any fruit or sign of it. So it is *now:* the penalties and disabilities, which it is proposed to abolish, do not lie on "*religious opinions*" at all, but on all disloyal and seditious practices, of which, if persons choose to be guilty, they must and ought to expect *penalties* and *disabilities;* and the true, the *only*, *relief* for them lies not with *us*, but with *themselves:* it is to be derived from *their altering* their *practices*, not from *our repealing* our *laws*.

But it is said, in the next place, that "Her

* Sir Roger L'Estrange, Toleration Discussed, p. 104.

† Apology for the Oath of Allegiance, Works, p. 252.

Majesty's *subjects"* should be relieved from these penalties; and that the "Queen ought to be the sovereign of *all* her *subjects."* This last assertion is very true: but then it is first to be ascertained whether they *are* her *subjects,* or will be so. Here is another fallacy lying hid under the word *subjects.* Would to Heaven, indeed, that they were her subjects; and that she were the sovereign of all her subjects! This indeed would be a most blessed consummation. Then all our controversy would be at end. But if, alas! some of her subjects are so forgetful of their duty to her as to withdraw their allegiance from her, and to take an oath of vassalage to a foreign power, it is a manifest absurdity to speak of their being any longer her "*subjects."* No: they have *revolted* from her; and no Acts of Parliament in the world can *make* them her subjects by *calling* them so. A parliament which attempts such a chimerical project as this only stultifies itself. And if our English laws are to be altered in the vain hope of changing the Pope's subjects into the Queen's, by "*relieving"* them from their disabilities for their disloyalty, then the inevitable consequence must be, that instead of *gaining* those who are *not* her subjects, she would *lose* those who *are,* and in lieu of being the "sovereign of *all* her subjects," she would be in very great danger of ceasing to be the sovereign of *any.*

From all that I have now said you will perceive, my dear Sir, that we in England have little reason,

and, I trust, little disposition, to boast ourselves at your expense. Every one who has the feeling of a true patriot, must indeed earnestly pray that his own beloved country and the crown of its august monarch may for ever remain *Christian*, and that it may ever remain *free*. But we should have little of the spirit of Christianity or of freedom, if we did not desire also for *you* what we so earnestly cherish for ourselves. Would that your Monarchy and Church were once more united together in a happy alliance, the one Christian, the other free! Why should not an Irenæus* arise once more among you to remind the Bishop of Rome of his true position, and to give him friendly rebuke instead of treacherous adulation? and why should not the French Church, animated by the spirit of the Gospel, endeavour to restore to the Crown those fair flowers of religion and piety which once bloomed upon it, but were torn from it by the hand of Revolution?

But, to revert to what I was saying: with *your* example before our eyes, with the exhibition which *you* present to us of the destruction of a *Church Establishment*, and of the lamentable consequences to the cause of Christianity and of the Crown, to the Church and to the Country, *we*, if we proceed further than we have already done in following your steps, shall be guilty of greater rashness and sin, and may expect greater misery and shame.

* Euseb. v. 24.

But we confidently hope better things. Our great Queen Elizabeth was excommunicated by three popes, Pius V., Gregory XIII., and Sixtus V., the last of whom sent the Spanish Armada against her, published a crusade against us, as if we were infidels, and gave plenary indulgence* to all who should assist in the invasion. She was assailed by numerous conspiracies. But she, who was cursed by Popes, was blessed by God. She was strong in His faith and fear, and in the love of her people; and to quote the words of her great minister, Lord Burleigh†, "For the comfort of all good subjects against the pope's bulls, it is manifest to the world, that from the beginning of her majesty's reign, by God's singular goodness, her kingdom hath enjoyed more universal peace, her people increased in more numbers, in more strength, and with greater riches, the earth of her kingdom hath yielded more fruits, and generally all kind of worldly felicity hath more abounded since and during the time of the pope's bulls, thunders, curses, and maledictions, than in any other long time before, when the pope's pardons and blessings came yearly into the realm; so that his curses and maledictions have turned back to himself and his fautors, and it may be said to the fortunate Queen of England and her people, 'The Lord thy God would not hear Balaam, but did turn

* Camden, Annales Eliz. lib. iii. ad ann. 1688.

† Execution, p. 35.

his curses into blessings;' the reason is, for because thy God loved thee."

So may it ever be with her successors on the throne of England!

Permit me, my dear Sir, to state what appears to me to be the great *practical* inference to be drawn from the facts and principles which I have now laid before you, and I will bring this Letter to a close.

First, I would venture to submit with great reverence and humility to the consideration of sovereign princes and states, whether, instead of *repealing their own* just and necessary laws against the papacy, they ought not rather to *unite together in requiring the Pope to retract his illegal acts and decrees* against their lawful authority; whether they ought not to *oblige* him to *withdraw the illicit oath* * which he now

* The following propositions deserve to be considered with regard to this oath :—

"1. Allegiance is a duty which every subject, under what form of government soever, by the law of *nature*, oweth to his country, and consequently to the sovereign power thereof.

"2. The bond of Allegiance, whether sworn or not sworn, is in the nature of it perpetual and indispensable.

"3. All Promises and Assurances, wherein faith is required to be given to another, ought to be understood *ad mentem imponentis*. [The *mens imponentis*, in the case of the Papal Oath, is clear from the Papal laws.]

"4. We cannot of our own accord enter into a covenant, wherein he, whose subjects we are, is concerned, without his consent.

"5. It is, otherwise, in his power by the equity of the law, Numb. xxx. to annul and make void the same at his pleasure."

These propositions are from Bp. Sanderson, "Case of the Engage-

presumes to impose on *their subjects*, and to erase from his *Canon Law*, his *Bullarium*, and his *Breviary*, all those seditious statutes, edicts, collects, lessons and imprecations, which infringe on their prerogatives, and impugn the royalties of the sovereign, and the liberties of the subject: whether, in short, they ought not at once to arise and emancipate themselves and their people (if he is unwilling to release them) from the thraldom to which he has reduced them, and which he is making daily more grievous to be borne; whether they ought not to warn him to confine himself within the limits of his own dominions in temporal concerns; and whether, in *spiritual* matters, they ought not to deliberate in their national Councils Civil and Ecclesiastical, on this important question: "Can it be shown by the law of God, and by the practice of the primitive Church, that the Bishop of Rome possesses any greater spiritual authority, power, or jurisdiction within their realms than any *other foreign* prelate of the Church?" and if this question be answered in the *negative*, then whether they ought not to require the Pope to restrain himself and his commands within the limits of his own patriarchate, according to the

ment," and of "the Solemn League and Covenant." See also his "Judicium Acad. Oxon. de Solenni Liga," 1 Jan. 1647.

The applicability of these observations to the Oath of Jesuits and Roman Catholic Bishops to the Pope, is too obvious to require to be further insisted on.

decree of the great General Council * of Nice; and, in the mean time, until such a consultation as this be held, whether *every* Nation and Church ought not to keep itself as near as may be to that order which it ought to have, according to law both human and divine, and, in so doing, to rest in faith on the aid and defence of Him Who is the Author of all Law and the Avenger of all Iniquity; and to look forward in sure and certain hope to that glorious time when the great Head of the whole Church, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, will come again to reward all His faithful subjects, and to put all His enemies under His feet.

I am, my dear Sir, with sincere regard,

Yours very faithfully,

CHR. WORDSWORTH.

* Canon 6.

THE END.

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, Printers, St. John's Square, London.

192335 280.20K
Wordsworth, Christopher W891.2

Letters to M. Gondon

192335 280.20K W891.2

St. Mark's Library
The General Theological Seminary
175 Ninth Avenue
New York, N. Y. 10011

Please stamp date in left column, write your name legibly in center column and leave right column blank. Deposit circulation card in slot marked 'Circulation cards'.

There is no date due, but books must be returned promptly upon request. Do not lend books charged to you to others.
You are responsible for them.